

Louis A. Boulay to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Ohio.

William F. Cochrane to be State director of the Public Works Administration in South Dakota.

Richard A. Hart to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Utah.

Eugene R. Hoffman to be State director of the Public Works Administration in Washington.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 17 (legislative day of Feb. 24), 1936

POSTMASTER

NORTH CAROLINA

Olivia A. Oppelt to be postmaster at East Flat Rock, in the State of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 17, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father in Heaven, be pleased to hear us as we wait at the altar of prayer. Grant grace, mercy, and peace to each of us and withdraw not the shield of Thy holy presence. We pray Thee, blessed Lord, to give us rich conceptions of the constancy of Thy goodness, which is woven of the silver and golden threads of divine affection. We entreat Thee to enlighten us in all our labors and inspire us to wise action, and may we seek to embody the truth in our thoughts and deliberations. We would hear the vow of the teacher of Israel: "I will behave myself wisely in a perfect way. I will set no wicked thing before mine eyes. I will hate the work of them that turn aside; it shall not cleave to me; a froward heart shall depart from me and I will not know wickedness." In the name of our Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 13, 1936, the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 11323. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the first settlement on Long Island, N. Y.;

H. R. 11849. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925; and

H. J. Res. 526. Joint resolution to authorize the Librarian of Congress to accept the property devised and bequeathed to the United States of America by the last will and testament of Joseph Pennell, deceased.

FEES OF JURORS AND WITNESSES IN UNITED STATES COURTS

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 568, to provide an additional appropriation for fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, for the fiscal year 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the hearings before the Appropriations Committee indicate that the appropriation, as I understand it, is exhausted or will be within a week and they have not the money to pay the jurors and the witnesses for the rest of this fiscal year. Is it not true, may I ask the gentleman from Texas, that they will have to shut down the courts if we do not do this?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am advised by the Attorney General that they will have to shut down the courts unless the appropriation is made. The appropriation is now \$100,000 in the red.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Nine hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RICH. And that is for witnesses?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Witness fees and fees of jurors in all United States courts.

Mr. RICH. And this is absolutely necessary in order to conduct the business of the courts?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly, and Congress cannot control the amount, because the cases are called for trial and the judges approve the bills; and whatever bills are approved, we have to pay. The fees are fixed by law.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman that I appreciate the work the gentleman is doing to keep down the expenses of government, but the gentleman ought to let the judges of this country know also that they are bringing in here exorbitant bills that they want us to approve, and it is our duty not only to look after the expenses we are incurring but the expenses incurred by other people who are coming here to ask for the money of the taxpayers, and I hope the gentleman will insist that they keep this expense down to the minimum.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We try to do that.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman why one statement was made that unless this appropriation is provided we would have to close up the courts within a week, and another statement was made that we are now \$100,000 overdrawn. Which statement is correct?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They are both correct.

Mr. BOILEAU. If we have gone \$100,000 in the red so far, how has that happened?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Obligations have been incurred by various courts in holding scheduled trials. There is no more money to pay jurors and witnesses and we cannot ask them to continue to hold court and tell jurors and witnesses they have no money to pay them. The overobligation of \$100,000 distributed among all our courts is not very embarrassing, but it does become so if it increases very much more without funds.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the courts were closed for a year, would we not be better off?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think not. I am in favor of law and order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I differ with the gentleman, but I am not going to object.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 568

Resolved, etc., That for an additional amount for fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, including the same objects specified under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1936, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$900,000 for the fiscal year 1936.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 567) to provide an additional appropriation for expenses of special and select committees of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this is required as a result of the deficiency that is in prospect as a result of the action of the House in giving this authority to spend money.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will state to my colleague that it is the result of the action of the House in authorizing these investigations and then fixing by resolutions the amount that may be expended by the several investigating committees. The Appropriations Committee and the Accounts Committee have no control over it after the House authorizes

it. The special committees can incur the expenses and they have to be met.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas why it is necessary to continue to have \$3,600 as a limitation on any legal talent that is retained by these committees?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thirty-six hundred dollars applies to any talent, legal or otherwise, and I think it is a very wise provision. What called for the enactment of that clause, for which I am partially responsible, was that we found out one select committee was paying \$14,000 a year for a man to help them. The Senate had a similar provision before the House adopted this.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman will allow me, I should like to ask this question: Why should a committee of the House or Senate be limited to paying only \$3,600 for an attorney to fight an attorney of William Randolph Hearst who is getting \$75,000? Are we not entitled to as good talent as they are?

Mr. BUCHANAN. They can make special arrangements when it becomes necessary.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. They tried to make special arrangements the other day to pay \$10,000 for an attorney and the House voted it down, and I am going to object to this.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 489.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 489

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11563, a bill declaring an emergency in the housing condition in the District of Columbia; creating a Rent Commission for the District of Columbia; prescribing powers and duties of the commission, and for other purposes; and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. General debate on said bill shall be considered as closed, and the bill shall be considered as having been read the second time. Amendments may be offered to any section of the bill, but debate under the 5-minute rule shall be closed within one hour and a half. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule for the consideration of the District of Columbia rent bill. The bill has been debated for 3 whole days. There was an obvious filibuster carried on against it, and it was thought best to bring in a rule to bring the matter to an issue.

This rule is not strictly a gag rule. There has been more debate on this bill than on any other ordinary bill. So debate has not been gagged.

All this rule does is to provide for an hour and a half of debate on amendments, and that the debate shall then close. That same results could be accomplished by a motion in the Committee of the Whole at any time, when debate could be shut off. The rule is in that respect more liberal than the general rules. It is true that the rule provides that the bill shall be considered as having been read the second time. The bill has been read in full the first time before the filibuster, and the waiver of reading the bill a second time denies no one any rights.

Under the rule the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and amendments are then in order to any part of the bill. Debate on these amendments must close within an hour and a half, but that does not cut off the offering of any amendment to the bill. There is no gag in the rule. A gag rule prevents or limits amendments. The rule is simply an attempt to expedite the business of the House. It does not go into the merits of the measure, but simply provides that, after due consideration, this House must function and that no fili-

bustering can be permitted to interfere with the orderly, expeditious, and respectable conduct of the proceedings in this House.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. RICH. A few minutes ago the chairman of the Appropriations Committee asked for additional funds for the various committees of the House. During the past few years we have had set up 41 organizations of the Government that are now functioning, and you are now asking for another commission.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As Major Bowes would say, "All right; all right; all right." [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I say, "All right"; but I want to say to you as chairman of the Rules Committee that the Rules Committee and you as chairman and leaders on that side must assume the responsibility for these appropriations.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will not the gentleman as a patriotic citizen help us to bear some of that responsibility?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Committee on Rules find themselves in a somewhat awkward position. We are opposed to the legislation because we believe that nothing will come of the bill except more taxes for the people and jobs for a few privileged ones who may be selected. Notwithstanding our opposition, we are quite in sympathy with bringing the measure to a vote. We think a vote should always be possible in a parliamentary body. However, I cannot let this stringent and unusual rule be presented and adopted without at least voicing a protest. Our good chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] says the rule is not strictly a gag rule. If it is not strictly a gag rule, then I do not know what a gag rule is. There is to be no debate on the bill which, if it is to be enacted into law, should be materially amended. Any amendments proposed will only have a debate of 90 minutes. This is certainly not sufficient debate for a bill of this character. Finally, we do want to impress on the membership of the House that, at least so far as the Republican members of the Committee on Rules are concerned, we sincerely hope the rule will not be a precedent for future actions of the House. It would be most unfortunate if it was to become a habit.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to establish any more commissions or set up a lot more organizations to investigate the Government and conditions in Washington when the law of supply and demand will regulate the housing conditions here probably just as well as it will in any other part of the country, and more so when we eliminate about 150,000 workers on the Government pay roll who ought to be back in our own districts instead of being in Washington and increasing the Government expense?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If that is a question, I will say that if I had my own way I would eliminate 90 percent of the commissions already in existence.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Let me assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is not a precedent, and, so far as I am concerned, will not be considered as such. We do not intend to bring District of Columbia bills in under rules. The District has 2 days a month for the purpose of legislation. The purpose of this rule is to perform a major operation in a very serious malady.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The statement of the chairman of the Committee on Rules placates us a great deal.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes up under a rule which makes its fair consideration absolutely impos-

sible. In fact, the only way that a bill of this character can be properly considered is by having reasonable debate and reasonable opportunity for amendment, which is denied by the rule, and the debate and opportunity for amendment ought to run along in order on 1 day. That has not happened in this case; but owing to the parliamentary situation which has resulted, it is impossible that it should come in that way.

The bill itself is an orphan. The gentleman who introduced it told the House that the bill is nothing to him. The chairman of the committee spent a very considerable time in abusing those who are opposed to it, without presenting any legitimate argument in its favor. In fact no one has presented here on the floor any legitimate argument in favor of the bill. I am in hopes that the membership of the House will cast their votes on the measure upon its merits and not because this man or that man has been abused and not because of any resentment against anyone. As a matter of fact, it is a bill of very considerable importance. Objections were made to this bill of a very valid character by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Its constitutionality was discussed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] last Monday, and he presented absolutely conclusive reasons why this House should not from a constitutional standpoint vote for any such bill as this. I do not want to have it charged to me when I am through in this House that in violation of what I regard my constitutional oath to be I deliberately voted for a measure knowing it to be unconstitutional.

This is not the first experience we have had with this kind of a bill. Such a bill was enacted into law in war-times, which hung over us for several years and there never were any rent reductions under that bill. But it is a nice juicy bill to provide nice juicy jobs and that is the only possible excuse for voting for it. Then, the folks who vote for those jobs have the additional excuse to carry back home to their constituents that their constituents do not have to pay for these jobs, because we saddle those jobs on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. Is not that a nice situation? No possible excuse for the bill except the creation of jobs, and we duck out from any responsibility for creating the jobs and say to our constituents that we saddle the expense on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. Is not that a nice picture for us to carry back, and will not we look proud when we carry it back?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. If the statement made is correct that they are going to saddle the expense on the taxpayers of the District of Columbia, then eventually we will have to make a greater contribution to the District of Columbia, because the people here will not be able to carry on the affairs of the Government.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I hardly believe that the Members in the House would have the nerve to raise the amount of the Federal contribution above what it is in the District of Columbia appropriation bill for this year, because the folks back home would have to pay some of those taxes, and I do not believe that the folks back home want to pay any more taxes for the benefit of the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. There will be considerable hesitancy when it comes to that proposition.

In addition to creating a nice lot of juicy jobs, I think I should like to call attention of the House to some of the high spots in this bill.

For the purposes of this act the commission or any officers, examiners, engineers, appraisers, attorneys, or such other employees or agents shall at all reasonable times have access to, for the purpose of examination, and the right to copy, any books, accounts, records, papers, or correspondence relating to any matter which the commission is authorized to consider or investigate.

They can look over an applicant's income tax to see whether he is in a position to pay the rent. They can look over all the books of anybody who owns any property at any time. I do not know whether other Members want to vote for that. I do not.

Here is another nice thing, on page 8:

Complaints may be made and filed by or on behalf of any tenant and by or on behalf of the owner of any rental property, notwithstanding the existence of a lease or other contract between the tenant and the owner or between the owner or any guest. The commission may, and if requested shall, file with its determination a finding of the facts on the evidence presented, and upon which its determination is based.

That means if you have a lease and the landlord wants to get rid of you he can go before this commission, which, as you know, will have a great lot of District of Columbia people on it, and he can try to get rid of you, notwithstanding the fact that you have a lease. Suppose you come down here when Congress meets and make a lease on an apartment to carry you through the winter and the landlord has two or three more come in who will pay more, and he goes to the commission and says that he has been renting you this apartment at a lower rate than will justify giving him a return. He can take you before that commission. He can show that he is losing money on the job, and he can throw your lease out, and you can move out in the middle of your term. You have absolutely no protection on a contract with this sort of thing. The same thing applies to the landlord.

If the commission determines that such rents, charges, service, or other terms or conditions are unfair, or unreasonable it shall determine and fix such reasonable rent or charges therefor, and fair and reasonable service, terms, or conditions of use, or occupancy, and may also order and require the furnishing of such service by the owner as it shall lawfully determine to be fair and reasonable for the particular premises involved.

That means that they can go to a piece of property, and they can require the owner to give service by installing elevators, by doing any and all sorts of things that will cost him money, without regard to whether that owner can stand the expense, or whether he can borrow the money for it or not, and they can wipe out the total value of that owner's property by that operation. I do not believe in turning over to any commission the power to do anything of that kind.

Again, on page 11:

The termination of the relation of landlord and tenant between the parties to any cause pending before the commission shall not deprive either party of the right to a hearing; or subsequent to the commission's determination therein, to a rehearing; or the right to recover in any action any sum which may be found to be due to either of the parties under such determination.

On page 13 they have some nice provisions:

The right of the tenant to the use or occupancy of any rental property existing at the time this act takes effect, or thereafter acquired, under any lease, or agreement for such use, or occupancy, or under any extension thereof by operation of law shall, notwithstanding the expiration of the term fixed by such lease or contract, continue at the option of the tenant subject, however, to any determination, or regulation of the commission relevant thereto—

Notwithstanding that the lease had expired—

and such tenant shall not be evicted or dispossessed so long as he pays the rent and performs the other terms and conditions of the tenancy as fixed by such lease or contract or, in case such lease or contract is modified by any determination or regulation of the commission, then as fixed by such modified lease or contract.

That means that a tenant can remain in possession of the property notwithstanding his lease has expired, notwithstanding the fact that the landlord has rented it to somebody else, notwithstanding, perhaps, that at the time that tenant hangs over, you or I have come down here a month or so ahead of time and have bargained for the apartment. If some tenant starts one of these proceedings, he can hang over and keep us from getting possession of a property that we have leased in good faith on our part from the landlord and which the landlord in good faith has leased to us. I do not believe the House of Representatives likes that kind of business.

Those are just a few of the things that are covered in this bill. I am not going to call attention to any more of them, because it seems to me the whole thing is absolutely ridiculous.

On page 23 there is a provision in section 21, as follows:

The provisions of this act shall not apply to a new building in the course of construction at the time of the enactment of this act or commenced thereafter.

Now, that is a sop to the fellow who is apt to build a building. Relief for tenants has always come in the regular way as a result of landlords building more buildings. If the landlord is making an excessive profit, he will build more buildings. You try to destroy what the landlord has, and at the same time you try to delude him into building more apartments or houses. Do you suppose that will fool anybody? This bill will do more than anything else to keep people from building buildings, to keep people from building apartment houses and houses, and to keep the rents up. I do not think the House of Representatives wants to pass any such a bill. It is clearly in violation of the Constitution.

The assertion has been made, in an attempt to fool the membership of the House, that this bill is opposed by real-estate agents. Personally, I know no real-estate agents in Washington. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who made a very good argument against this bill on the first day it was being considered, told us that he knew none of these real-estate agents. Frankly, I do not make it my practice to spend my time going to real-estate agents' banquets in the District of Columbia, nor to banquets given by any other outfit that would embarrass me in any way in performing my legislative duties here in this House. I do not believe the majority of the Members of the House spend their time this way; I do not believe the majority of our Members or any substantial number of them do. I think they want to meet what problems are theirs honestly, fairly, and face to face.

Summarizing in just a word, we have here, first, a bill that is unconstitutional; secondly, we have the experience with a previous bill which resulted in raising rents instead of lowering them and giving no relief to the tenants; thirdly, we have a bill containing a lot of absolutely ridiculous and unworkable provisions; fourthly, this bill is an orphan, the sponsor of which does not come out and tell us what the bill is, what it will do, fairly and straightforwardly. This is a bill in which abuse of those opposed to it is relied on as an argument for your support—nothing else; just bare abuse.

I hope the House will beat this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I did not have occasion to read this bill until this morning. Frankly I am astounded that such a proposal as this should be seriously presented to this House with the expectation of favorable action.

This bill is State socialism with a vengeance. It violates every property right known to the law. Nothing worse has ever come out of Russia. It is an effort to shackle American freedom. In spite of this statement I am supporting the rule, for I want the question brought to an issue in this House for final determination one way or the other.

The rent commission to be set up under this bill will be able to establish complete dominion over the property rights of the people of the District of Columbia. The bill declares that all rental property in the District is affected with a public interest. A more absurd statement I do not think it possible for an intelligent mind to utter.

Do you know what is involved? Are you acquainted with the provisions of the bill? If you are not, then, in justice to yourself, I urge that you hurriedly scan the language of the bill before you go on record.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. With pleasure.

Mr. BLANTON. Yet, regarding such a bill as the gentleman has denounced, his great Rules Committee has brought in a rule stating that all points of order against the bill are waived, although points of order are to protect Members and to give them means to stop such outrageous bills.

Mr. COX. Let me say to the gentleman that I am meeting my responsibility as I understand it. The committee voted out this rule because of what has heretofore taken place with respect to the effort to get the bill to consideration in the House. While I do not like the bill or a single declaration contained in it—it is wholly and absolutely repugnant to my

sense of justice—yet I think there was justification for the Rules Committee voting out this rule, because it brings the question to a vote in the House in the event the rule is adopted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Has anything been done by any of us not in accordance with the rules?

Mr. COX. No; that is true.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman helped make the rules.

Mr. COX. My committee reported the rule and for that reason I shall vote for it, but I shall vote against the bill if the rule is adopted, and hope it will be defeated. Rental charges in Washington are far too high, but we cannot afford to violate all property rights as a means of rectifying the evil. [Here the gavel fell.]

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S OBJECTIVE

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an address on the subject of President Roosevelt's objectives, delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the radio over the Yankee network on April 14 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered over the radio on April 14 last by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]:

Ladies and gentleman of the radio audience, at the outset I want to express my appreciation to the officials of station WNAC, Boston, and of the Yankee network for affording me the use of their facilities on this occasion, enabling me to speak to my friends and to the people of my district, comprising South Boston, Dorchester, Mattapan, and Hyde Park, and to the people of New England, from the Capital City of Washington.

In the brief time allotted to me I am going to discuss the objective of the present Democratic administration, under the constructive and courageous leadership of President Roosevelt. The observations that I will make are based on my studies and experiences as a Member of the Congress during the present Democratic and the past Republican administrations.

What is the objective of President Roosevelt and the present Democratic administration? That is a question that one hears on every hand. It is on everyone's lips. It is a proper and natural question to ask. In a few words, the objective is greater economic security and greater social justice for our people. When we view the legislation recommended by President Roosevelt, this objective is apparent.

In looking over an administration, the same as looking over any person's public record, and just the same as another looking over our own record of life to date, the whole picture should be viewed and passed upon. To form and pass judgment on one act, either in public or private life, is not the correct and fair premise upon which to proceed. The whole picture should be viewed and honest judgment passed upon that picture instead of forming judgment upon one act that may not be approved in disregard to all others. As we look over the picture of this administration we see one of courageous leadership, of honest effort, of the attempt on the part of President Roosevelt to do the best that he possibly could under the existing circumstances. That is all that can be expected of anyone.

In considering what I have to say I call to your attention that every person, whether in or out of public life who has ever led and who in the future will lead the fight for the average person, will be attacked, vilified, and subjected to every effort and charge to try and inflame the people's minds against him in order that his efforts in behalf of the people will be defeated. It must be borne in mind that economic insecurity is a dreadful condition for any person to undergo. It is one of the curses of mankind. It is the duty of our Government to try as far as possible and proper within constitutional means to minimize the distressful condition of economic insecurity. It must also be borne in mind that economic insecurity can be decreased by the elimination of certain abuses which the present administration has undertaken to remove or control for the general welfare of our people. I will refer to them as I proceed.

I have said that the objective of President Roosevelt is to obtain greater economic security and greater social justice for the American people. I am now going to mention the legislation proposed by him and passed by a Democratic Congress in support of that assertion.

The present administration is divided into two parts: (1) Emergency legislation and (2) permanent legislation. The present depression, out of which we are emerging, brought economic insecurity to millions of our people who, in normal times, with employment, would be in a fairly satisfactory economic position. The depression

affected this great class adversely, and something had to be done for them and for all others similarly affected.

To clearly appreciate the problems that faced President Roosevelt when he was inaugurated on March 4, 1933, we must permit our minds to go back to those trying days in order to understand the objective that he had in mind—greater economic security and social justice for our people. At that time the country was facing chaos. Over 5,000 banks had failed or had been suspended during the previous year; the deposits of 20,000,000 of our people, their life's savings in most cases, were threatened with loss. Our banking system, the economic lifeblood of our Nation, was imperiled. The Federal Government under the previous Republican administration had failed to act in behalf of human suffering. Local government—State and municipal—and local charities which had been carrying the relief burden for over 3 years, were unable to meet the demands. Around 15,000,000 of our people were unemployed. The abuses of the stock exchanges, which had contributed to bringing about the depression, still existed; nothing had been done to regulate or control them. The sale of fictitious stock, as a result of which our people were robbed of hundreds of millions of dollars each year, was still permitted. Foreclosure of home and farm and bankruptcy of business were general. Agriculture was in a terrible condition. Despair existed everywhere. Business leadership had failed to assume its duties and responsibilities. The air of defeatism prevailed. Some were even saying that we could not survive this depression. I refer to these facts to indicate the conditions and the feelings of fear that existed. In brief that was the situation that faced President Roosevelt. Under his leadership these conditions have changed. He undertook to meet the problems of the day. He gave to us what we were seeking and praying for—courageous leadership.

It must also be remembered that today we are looking back, while in 1933 we were looking forward. It must also be borne in mind that hindsight is always better than forethought. It is the easiest thing in the world to be a critic. It must be remembered also that we have been enveloped in the greatest economic catastrophe that has ever confronted the world in its entire history. It must also be remembered that the problems of government are many in days of adversity—they are few in days of prosperity. The only real problem in days of prosperity is to prevent the unreasonable expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

The first act of President Roosevelt was to save our banking system and the life's savings of 20,000,000 of our people. That act of his electrified the country. By saving our banking system and the deposits of millions he also saved our insurance companies, our entire financial and business life, which are dependent upon the existence of proper banking facilities. Certainly his act in the banking situation, constructive and courageous, meant greater economic security for all of our people, without regard to whether or not we had any money on deposit in any bank at that time. This courageous act alone entitles President Roosevelt to the everlasting gratitude of our people.

In addition, and to assure greater economic security to our people, he strengthened our banking laws, so that we will not be faced in the future with a destruction of our banking system and of the wiping away of the life's savings of millions of our people. Not content with that, and in addition, he recommended, and the Congress passed, a law guaranteeing deposits in banks up to \$5,000. Over 15,000 banks are members of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and all depositors of those banks are guaranteed payment of their deposits up to the sum of \$5,000, and at no expense to the taxpayers. He not only met the emergency situation by closing all banks to prevent chaos, but President Roosevelt has obtained the passage of permanent legislation assuring protection of deposits and greater economic security for the American people.

I next refer to the unemployment problem. What about their insecurity, due to no fault of their own? What about the results of undernourishment that are passed on from parents to children, the effects of which take at least two generations to die out? Faced with the inability of local government and of charitable organizations to carry on, President Roosevelt acted. He recommended and the Congress responded in order that emergency security, pending the return to normalcy, might be given to the unfortunate victims of the depression—millions of American citizens—of human beings. Relief had to be extended, and it was extended, to relieve human suffering and distress and to prevent the long-time effects of undernourishment.

The legislation to protect homes and farms against foreclosure, and to also save our banks, insurance companies, financial and business activities of all kinds, necessary for employment of millions—all have as their objective greater economic security and social justice. His efforts to stimulate business through increased consumption, and thereby increased production, resulting during the past 3 years in the reemployment of over 5,000,000 persons, also assure greater security to those benefited. That great battle, the complete return to normalcy and on a sounder basis, with the resultant reemployment of the still unemployed, is still going on. Better understanding between employer and employee through the labor legislation that has been passed is also a part of this picture. That is a very important part of his objective. Improved business profits, which all right-thinking people want to see, have occurred since his inauguration, resulting in reemployment and greater security for both employer and employee. The attempt to obtain a greater distribution of earnings, an important and necessary part of any social-justice plan, aims toward greater economic security for all.

Social-security legislation providing for old-age pensions for the needy—the first time in our history that the Federal Government has done this—which can at a later date be somewhat increased as conditions improve; unemployment insurance, to reduce the hardships of a future depression; old-age contributory annuities, enabling employees to obtain an earned annuity when their years of productivity are over—are also powerful evidences of his objective of greater economic security and of greater social justice.

Stock exchanges—a means of the purchase and sale of corporate securities—have a useful and necessary place in our financial and business life. However, abuses have no place therein. Such abuses have been a contributing factor to most of the depressions that we have had. Such abuses played an important part in bringing about the present depression. The regulation or control of such abuses is necessary for our future welfare—and for our national economic security. Over 20 years ago a congressional committee recommended legislation regulating the abuses of stock exchanges. It was under the leadership of President Roosevelt, despite powerful opposition, that it was accomplished.

The legislation to prevent the watering of stock and to prevent the fraudulent issuance and sale of stock was passed under his leadership, saving the American investors hundreds of millions of dollars each year, thereby assuring greater protection and greater economic security.

The effort to shorten the workweek as one of the means of preventing displacement of human labor by labor-saving machinery, the elimination of child labor, of the sweatshop, started by President Roosevelt, the victory of which he is fighting to achieve, and will, with your help and support, are also important parts of his great objective. The regulation and control of the abuses of finance and of industry, the prevention of monopoly, the effort to enable the small-business man to continue in competitive business, are known by all, and are necessary for the economic security of our people.

In a troubled world, filled with selfish nations, with no regard for international agreements and treaties, and the necessity of our national defense, of means to assure our national security, have received his consideration, resulting in a proper increase of our Army and Navy to assure adequate national defense in case of attack. It is the duty of a nation to preserve its own existence to retain its place among the nations of the world, and to employ such means as will assure its continued existence. That has been done.

I call to your attention the fact that while a Congressman represents a district—a Senator a State—the President represents the whole United States. He must view the country and the people as a whole. It is only natural to expect that there are some parts of the program of President Roosevelt with which some do not agree. However, the objective of greater economic security is one, I am sure, with which we all agree. As we look over the whole picture, when we compare the conditions of today with those of March 1933, which President Roosevelt inherited, I submit to all honest and fair-minded persons that it is a fine picture to view. Some complain about expenses. That will probably be the main issue next fall. In this connection, let me remind you that when sickness comes into our family—when someone of our loved ones is seriously ill—the family expenses go up rapidly. We will do anything, spend all we have, and borrow, if necessary, to save our loved one. In March of 1933 we were a sick Nation—very ill—seriously afflicted with a disorganized economic system and its dreadful results. Under the leadership of President Roosevelt we are now recovering from that condition. By the election of 1932 we sought a different leadership and treatment of our national sickness and its problems. As a Nation and as a people we did not want to leave our illness subject only to the treatment of past depressions and the leadership that we had received from 1929 to 1933, with the harshness and suffering of the cold and destructive policy of doing nothing—of letting the natural laws of economics run their course.

With the mandate of the people, President Roosevelt gave leadership and treatment to the sick Nation that have brought results. That policy, of necessity, called for large expenditures to bring the patient back to health. Now that we are convalescing let us not forget the acute pain and suffering of those days. Let us realize that money had to be spent, and will have to be spent, to obtain for our people the complete recovery that we are all seeking. The economic illness of a nation brings unexpected and unusual expenses just the same as the illness of a loved one brings it to the family.

Therefore, as we view the emergency and permanent policies of President Roosevelt, we see that their objective is greater economic security and greater social justice for all of our people. That is a fight which has been waged from time immemorial—it will continue as long as the human race exists. Those who lead this fight must expect to meet strong opposition—the attempt to instill fear of such leadership in the minds of the people whom they seek to assist—the determined effort to create misunderstanding as to their motives and objectives. President Roosevelt has met and will continue to meet such opposition. However, with an understanding on the part of our people of his great objective—greater economic security and greater social justice for our people—with the realization on your part that he is leading your fight—with your help and support—he will continue to wage this fight to obtain for us, in our day, improved conditions—bringing to us a stronger feeling of protection and a greater feeling of spiritual and material happiness and contentment, and passing on to the future generations the knowledge that we of this generation met and determined our problems in a manner that was for the best interests of this and future generations of America.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT BILL

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes, the balance of my time, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, had this bill been considered on its merits, the first time it came up it would, in my judgment, have been overwhelmingly defeated. We should now lay aside all personal feeling and defeat it today. But we all know what happened, those opposing it, believing it unconstitutional, started and carried on a filibuster and because of the delay, because of the many roll calls, and of the personalities which were indulged in, because of the filibuster, this rule became necessary. The rule is a practical answer to the filibuster and will enable the House to dispose of this legislation and to do it at once, though it should be remembered that the gentleman from Texas in opposing this bill only exercised his rights under the rules of this House, and believing as he undoubtedly does that the bill is unconstitutional, and being perhaps somewhat in doubt as to the ultimate outcome, characteristically and very vigorously and tenaciously stuck to his plan of attempting to defeat it at all hazards, regardless of any inconvenience he might cause.

There is no question in the minds of those who come from outside the District and who have not been in the habit of paying exorbitant rates that we should have legislation which would accomplish the purpose which presumably is the object of this bill.

There is no question, there can be no question, in the minds of those familiar with rents charged for homes, apartments, rooms, and with the rates charged by hotels in other cities of like size for accommodations similar to those offered in Washington, but that we who are called here on Government business are being unmercifully gouged. There should be, and there is, a way to overcome this condition. For my part, if this District is under control of the Congress, I cannot understand why we who are forced to come here in order to perform our duties, why those who come to assist us, those who come to visit us on business or pleasure, those who have business with the departments which can only be transacted here in the Nation's Capital should not have living accommodations and have them at a reasonable price. Some of the people who live here, some of those who own and rent this real estate, who operate the hotels, reply, "We do not ask you to come here; you do not need to come here; if you do not like it, you should go elsewhere." But that is not the situation, that is not altogether true. We have no choice. The District happens to be the seat of the National Government. It is here that the larger portion of the Nation's business must be transacted. There is no other place to which we can go and perform our duties. There is no other location where this business can be transacted.

Nor is there any question but that the rents charged are exorbitant—that advantage is taken of the situation. Last year some of us were charged almost twice as much for the rooms we occupied as were those who occupied them the preceding year. This year rates are still higher. Some of the rooms I have been in were small, altogether too small for a large man, a trunk, or a suitcase.

Mr. HAMLIN rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I see the gentleman from Maine, who has arisen. The small rooms do not bother me, because I am a little fellow, and I can crawl into almost any place, but my good friend the gentleman from Maine, 6 feet 3 inches, and 240 pounds of a big fellow from top to bottom—he is big, not only physically but intellectually, greatest of all, perhaps, in his kindly good-fellowship. He should have a room in which he can move about, in which he could not only move but breathe. It may be all right to put a little fellow in a cell, but a big man like my friend should have room and plenty of it.

Mr. Speaker, after all, is the District of Columbia controlled by the Government, by the Congress—is it the place set apart for the transaction of the Nation's business, for the residence, temporary though it may be, of those who come

here as officials, of those who come to assist in carrying on the governmental work? Or is it only the property of the individuals who come here to profit from the salaries and the wages of the employees?

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Of course the gentleman knows that every Member on the floor of the House has constituents here in Washington who are being gouged.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. We are all glad to have the home folks visit us and to be privileged to show them the historic places in the city. But we do not wish to see them overcharged. Today three of the loveliest young women from my home town, Miss Cordelia Lockner, Miss Helen Lockner, and Miss Mildred Schelhas, two of whom have been associated with the home office for a number of years, are here. When they came to Washington they discovered that the hotels were filled. There was no place for them, and so it became necessary that I give up to them the place which I had in this fine building just across the park because they could not get a place elsewhere. This, of course, was a pleasure; but when you reach my age, after you have become eligible to the Townsend pension, just any place to sleep will not do. And good rooms are hard to find. This thing of going out and sleeping in your car or crawling into a barrel or a box or an old building is not altogether agreeable to an old man. Others of the home folks went down to Alexandria and to other points outside the city because they could not find accommodations in Washington.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman realize that the rights of the property owners here in the District of Columbia are taken away from them under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I realize that full well. In my judgment those provisions and the other which would impair the obligation of a contract render the bill unconstitutional and will force many to vote against it. I am only speaking now for the moment of the conditions which exist here in the District.

Mr. COX. We concede that the condition exists, but does the gentleman want to take one's property rights away from him in order to remedy that situation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; but here is the answer to that. Those people who own this property came here from choice. You may say, "We come for the same reason", but that is not strictly accurate. We seek office or employment from choice, but we have no choice as to the place where the service is to be rendered. We are servants of the people, the people established this location as the seat of government, and here we must serve. Carry the thought to its logical conclusion: the Government will grow, the number of employees will increase, the size of the District remains the same. If a real-estate speculator or a group of speculators purchased the available property, a monopoly would be created, rents might be raised, Congressmen, the secretaries, Government employees, and officials, unless unbelievably wealthy, would have no place to stay. Such a situation is a possibility. There must some day be regulation to prevent monopoly and extortion. If someone's property rights must be destroyed, then the rule of necessity must be applied. If one of two innocent persons must suffer, then, of necessity, the Government must protect itself, its officials, its employees, and those who come here to profit in a business way, either through real estate or otherwise, must be regulated. The charges must be limited.

This bill is bad as drawn, its provisions unconstitutional. Another bill should be brought in which will be just, equitable, and accomplish the designed purpose. Most assuredly, if the Congress controls the territory within the District of Columbia, emergency or no emergency, it has the right, the duty, to protect itself and those who are necessary to its existence.

For this rule I cannot vote for the reason that it is merely a device, expedient for the moment, to thwart the purpose of the gentleman from Texas and from New York in their efforts

to defeat this unconstitutional legislation. For the bill itself I cannot vote, though I believe in the purpose which presumably is sought to be accomplished, because I believe the bill is not constitutional, and there is no reason why we should shirk our responsibility and throw upon the Supreme Court of the United States, already overburdened, the task of considering legislation which we believe to be legally unsound. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Louisiana for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGABILITY, ETC., OF THE CONNECTICUT RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4979) to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, and to promote the general welfare of the United States by improving the navigability, controlling the flood waters, and eliminating the pollution of the Connecticut River and its tributaries; by providing for the development and improvement of forest reserves, recreational grounds, parks, and highways, and the preservation of wildlife; by promoting agriculture and industry, and by producing electrical energy for interstate transmission, and also by providing healthy water supplies; and for the relief of unemployment among the people in the Connecticut River Valley and neighborhood; and further, for the creation of a corporation to carry out the aforesaid be rereferred from the Committee on Flood Control to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill to which the gentleman referred this morning in committee?

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. It is the same bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

ROOSEVELT, DEMOCRACY'S GREAT LEADER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio speech made recently by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GRANFIELD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech delivered by my colleague, Hon. WILLIAM J. GRANFIELD, of Massachusetts, over the Yankee network in Washington, D. C., on April 16, 1936, on Roosevelt, Democracy's Great Leader, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, upon the approaching election will depend whether this Nation is to go forward to the great destiny which our forefathers conceived for it. That President Roosevelt will be renominated is a foregone conclusion, and I very much doubt if any other name will be presented to the Democratic convention in Philadelphia for this high honor. More than that, I am firmly convinced that under his banner Democracy will triumph in November and the great reforms he has initiated carried through to success.

It is interesting to note the reaction of what is generally known as big business to the coming election. Three years ago, when President Roosevelt assumed office, the country was on the verge of chaos. Industry, commerce, and agriculture were all but prostrate. At that time, the men representing big business came to Washington and pleaded with President Roosevelt to do something to save them. Their one fear, very privately expressed, was that he would not prove strong enough for the task, and they demanded that Congress stand back of him to a man. One after another of the so-called New Deal measures were enacted and placed in operation, and slowly but surely the Nation began to climb out of the depression into which it had been plunged by 12 years of Republican misrule. Harkening to the pleas of big business, the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which had been created during the Hoover regime, were greatly enlarged and expanded. This agency, pouring out millions to

banks, insurance companies, railroads, and industry generally, saved the situation for them, and firms which were on the brink of bankruptcy found a new measure of hope as earnings increased and dividends became something more than a mirage. No sooner had this been accomplished, however, than many of the men, beneficiaries of this governmental aid, grew resentful of restrictions placed on them by other measures, such as the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. It was then they began muttering against President Roosevelt and demanding that the Government turn business "loose." To them he became a Stalin, a Hitler, a Mussolini. The accomplishments of the President and his Democratic Congress were termed "communistic, socialistic, and paternalistic." They wanted to be saved, but were unwilling to aid in saving the rest of the country, at least if it was going to cost them anything to do it.

Although the Supreme Court declared the National Recovery Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration unconstitutional, big business was still dissatisfied, and it refused to play the game fairly. As it has been pointed out by President Roosevelt, after the Supreme Court decision declaring the National Recovery Administration unconstitutional industry began to tighten up all along the line, and it increased hours of labor and reduced wages wherever and whenever it was possible. Many of the big concerns which under the Agricultural Adjustment Act were called upon to pay processing taxes either passed them on to the consumers or back to the producers, and when this act was declared unconstitutional they were in the fine position of the man who may eat his cake and have it, too. The refunds to the meat packers alone were \$51,000,000; and, since contracts had been made with the farmers, this had to be made good through new taxes, some of which are now being considered by the Congress.

Even this bounty did not satisfy some of them, however, and they are demanding that the Nation go back to what President Roosevelt had graphically described as the "rule of the fang and claw." Executives of big business, bankers, Wall Street operators, and industrialists such as the Du Ponts, and a few high-priced lawyers are bemoaning the loss of their so-called liberties and the alleged invasion of the Constitution. They are shedding tears over regimentation. Yet, in spite of their constant opposition, the country has been forging ahead.

That the great corporations, many of whose executives are numbered among the opponents of the present administration and outstanding critics of the New Deal, are tilting at windmills is manifest by stock-market reports. Since the inauguration of President Roosevelt and the return of confidence among investors, as well as increased business due to New Deal measures, the gain in stock values listed upon the New York Exchange would more than pay the national debt. A statement has just been issued which shows that 1,148 corporations during the last year alone showed net gains in their earnings of 47½ percent. In items of dollars this report, which was compiled by the Standard Statistics Co. of New York, shows total net earnings of these concerns amounted to \$2,029,999,000 for the year 1935. This may be compared with the net earnings of the same concerns during 1934 of \$1,481,551,000. Certainly no one in authority or in his right mind could contend that these concerns are not in a more healthy and flourishing condition than they were a year ago, and yet the critics of the New Deal insist it is hurting business. The officers of these corporations may oppose President Roosevelt, but it will be difficult, indeed, for them to convince their stockholders that the administration which restored dividends is not entitled to support.

Among the outstanding critics of the administration are some of the large, heavily financed, and well-entrenched newspapers of the country. Their writers, columnists, and cartoonists are bending every effort at their command and exerting all their talents to belittle the various New Deal agencies so instrumental in recovery, and editorial columns ring with charges that the Government is driving us to ruin, business gone to the dogs, and national credit wrecked. Yet their advertising pages of the stock-market reports belie everything they say, and their own advertisements urging advertisers to avail themselves of opportunity to reap the rich rewards of salesmanship through their columns reveals that they don't believe their own editorials.

One of the slogans upon which Republican spellbinders are relying to win voters in the approaching campaign is "balance the Budget." No one can deny that it would be a fine thing if the National Budget could be balanced, but if this must be done at the expense of business recovery, hunger and suffering, and human misery, it had better stay unbalanced for a while at least. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that it was not Mr. Roosevelt who developed the unbalanced Budget. Under President Hoover the national debt was increased \$6,000,000,000, and instead of making progress against the depression, business continued to grow worse. The deficit under Federal revenues for the last 4 years is slightly more than it was for the 4 years of the Hoover administration, but there is a clear-cut difference between the deficits created during these two administrations. That of the Hoover administration was a net loss so far as the Nation is concerned, while a very substantial amount, considerably over half, in fact, of that which has developed during the last 3½ years is represented by gilt-edged securities held by the various governmental agencies. The \$3,000,000,000 loaned through the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is amply secured by mortgages on the homes it saved. The same is true of loans made through the Farm Credit Administration, and also by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As recovery advances, these loans are being repaid and may be recovered back into the Treasury to reduce the deficit, while no such course is possible with any of that \$6,000,000,000 spent during the Hoover administration over and above the current revenues. Another complaint that is going up from the Republicans is that relief money has been squandered. They charge extravagance and worse in the operation of various relief agencies. "Boondoggling" has become a fearful word to dangle in front of the voters. Charges of petty corruption are magnified and made to appear colossal. Sifted down, most of these charges are trivial and insignificant. They represent the petty chiseling of some unfortunates on relief. How do they compare with the looting of the Nation's oil reserves condoned by Republican Presidents or the enormous fraud uncovered in the Veterans' Bureau?

Meanwhile, under the direction of this administration the Home Owners' Loan Corporation has saved a million homes, the Farm Credit Administration almost an equal number of farms, hundreds of thousands of young men have been placed in C. C. C. camps to learn the rudiments of forestry and the dignity of labor. Slums have been wiped out in some 40 or 50 cities, and thousands of farm families moved from poor, worn-out lands to farms on which they can make a living and become self-sustaining. Thousands of miles of electric power lines have been stretched out into rural sections to lighten the labors of hundreds of thousands of farmers. Public buildings, post offices, new roads have been constructed, and at the same time money has been advanced to the States to relieve hunger and want for those unable to find employment.

Early in his administration President Roosevelt said no one would go hungry if he could prevent it. That was a covenant with the Nation, and he has kept the faith. These are the things which the great body of people see, and no amount of propaganda by Republican newspapers or Republican spellbinders can blind them to these solid and substantial facts. Undoubtedly this is the reason for the large increase of Democratic strength in hitherto Republican strongholds, and which has startled the high command of that party. California, long looked upon as solidly Republican as Vermont, now shows a Democratic superiority of 426,441 in registration in seven counties alone. In the recent primary in Wisconsin, President Roosevelt received twice as many votes as the two wings of the Republican Party combined; and since the BORAH forces represented more than half the Republican strength, it is reasonable to assume if Mr. BORAH is not nominated for President on the Republican ticket, a highly improbable assumption at this time, that many of his supporters in that State will vote for President Roosevelt. Tuesday's primary in Illinois revealed a similar situation, save that the BORAH faction was not relatively as strong. However, the Democratic forces polled nearly two votes for every one cast for Republican candidates, and the only question as to Illinois in the November election will be the size of President Roosevelt's majority.

During the next 6 months the voters of this Nation will be bombarded with propaganda and editorial tirades against President Roosevelt. He will be denounced on one side as a czar and a tyrant, and in the next breath he will be called weak and ineffective. He will be charged with squandering billions of dollars and will be credited with every individual instance of suffering, which will be magnified into a national calamity. While some of the people may be fooled or beguiled by this, the great majority, I am sure, will remain steadfast, loyal, and unafraid, and they will again demonstrate the truth of Abraham Lincoln's maxim that you can't fool all the people all the time. I am firmly convinced that President Roosevelt will be reelected in November and that the Congress will be as strongly behind him as it is today, and that, in the light of history as it will be read by the future generations, the death knell of special privilege was rung in this Nation in 1932—that the decision of the voters of 1932 was confirmed in 1936, and that a new epoch was created wherein the rights of the average man to his job, and security for his home and in his old age became a sacred trust to this Nation, and no less for protection for the special few.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RENT BILL

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I never engage in a futile fight. Under this very remarkable rule no fight for proper amendments could be made against this bill which would not be futile, hence I shall offer no amendments.

This rule will go down in history. This is a bill which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], an authority on the Constitution, denominates as communistic, unconstitutional, ridiculous, and "worse than anything that has ever come out of Russia."

This rule waives all points of order on this sort of a bill. The rule closes general debate on the bill. The bill will not be read under the 5-minute rule like other bills, this rule even taking that right away from the membership. It is not to be read under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Please do not take my time.

Mr. COX. I want to support the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad I have such a distinguished convert. I have only 10 minutes, and I want to use the 10

minutes, although I have deep affection for the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I yielded to the gentleman when I had the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield later to my friend. I want to make a statement first, and then I will yield.

Mr. Speaker, this rule prescribes that the bill has already been read under the 5-minute rule, so that the usual second reading of the bill has been dispensed with and it will not even be read now. Debate on all amendments is limited to an hour and a half.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. Please let me finish; then I shall yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of this House were not formulated merely to pass bills. The rules of the House are to afford a means for the membership to pass good bills, and the rules are also to afford a means to the membership who know the rules to stop bad bills from being passed by pursuing those rules. Every single thing that we have done to stop this bad bill has been done in strict accord with the rules of the House. Not a rule has been violated. If we had not delayed the passage of this bill until time afforded the membership an opportunity to understand it, we would have had no chance whatever of killing it.

Even the distinguished and able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] stated a few minutes ago that he "did not have occasion to read this bill until this morning", yet after reading it and today understanding it, he said he was astounded at such a proposal; that "it is socialism with a vengeance"; that "it violates every property right known to law"; and that "nothing worse has ever come out of Russia"; and he said that it is "an effort to shackle American freemen." Is not that a terrible indictment? If we had not delayed the bill, he would not have had an opportunity to read it, or to have reached that very statesmanlike conclusion.

Now, there has not been one thing done in this House with respect to this bill except what the rules authorize. Everything that has been done in this House respecting this bill, in an attempt to keep it from passing, has been in strict conformity with the rules, upheld by the Speaker of the House—get that.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] says that this is a communistic bill. This bill, as is well known to the membership, is intimately connected with another bill that is even more communistic, a bill that puts communism back into the 175 schools of Washington, where there are 2,968 teachers, and where there are 99,000 little school children, known as the Sisson bill.

Now, the efforts that some of us have been making to stop this bill also have been made incidental to stopping that Sisson bill that puts communism back in the schools. Without this rule this Ellenbogen bill could never be passed in this Congress, and without this rule this Sisson bill could never be passed in this Congress. When we delayed the Ellenbogen bill we at the same time delayed the Sisson bill, and were killing two birds—both red—with one stone, as Members of Congress now know all about both bills.

All of us have the right to name bills, have we not? I am going to name two bills, and I hope they will be known by these names from now until eternity. Instead of calling this the Ellenbogen bill, from now on I want it known by the name of the Ellenbogen-O'Connor-Rules-Committee bill. [Laughter.] Instead of knowing the Sisson bill as the Sisson bill, I am going to name it now, and I want it known hereafter as the Sisson-O'Connor-Rules-Committee bill [laughter and applause] that seeks to put communism back in the schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not even going to offer an amendment to this bill. I will offer one preferential motion. I am not even going to move to strike out the ridiculous provision which says that Congress reserves to itself the right to alter or amend this bill. I understand, however, the committee will do that. I am not even going to move to strike out any of its many unsound provisions. They are consistent with every other part of the bill, and one part is just as sound

as any other part of the bill. All I am going to do, under such a rule, is reserve the right to offer a preferential motion and to vote against this bill and to vote against the Sisson bill. I have done my duty by both of them. I have worked hard to stop both of them. I have done many hours of work, when some of you were asleep, in trying to stop these infamous measures, especially the Sisson measure that puts communism back into the schools of Washington.

Mr. COX and Mr. McCORMACK rose.

Mr. BLANTON. I will yield in just a moment. I am trying to get through in order to yield to my friend the gentleman from Georgia, as I promised him, and for fear I will not be able to do so I yield to him now.

Mr. COX. Let me state to the gentleman that as a member of the Rules Committee I am not at all proud of this rule.

Mr. BLANTON. It ought not to be here if you are not proud of it.

Mr. COX. If adopted, nothing could be more unfortunate than for it ever to be accepted as a precedent.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not call it "the Cox bill." [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. I know, and I am, in a measure, supporting the position that the gentleman takes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed of anything I have done about these two bills. I have done all I could to kill them. I have done my duty. I have done everything a man could do under the rules of this House to stop these two communistic measures.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute. And to show what our Subcommittee on Appropriations that handled the District of Columbia bill, and took out of the bill \$78,660 for so-called character education, has done, and to show you colleagues why we did it, I went to the trouble of working weeks to assemble the facts in the RECORD for you, which you will find in my speech of April 2, 1936, beginning on page 4838, and I checked up every fact before I printed this speech in the RECORD. You will find it printed in the RECORD of April 2, 1936, at page 4838, and I invite the Members to read that convincing evidence which we developed at our hearings. Read the testimony of Dr. Ballou and his admissions, read the testimony of his professor of social studies (Jones) and his admissions, and then if you can vote for that Sisson bill when it comes up, all right; it will be your responsibility.

This bill cannot hurt me—neither one of them can hurt me—if you want this kind of communistic, unconstitutional measure to go on the statute books, all right. I, myself, do not own a piece of property in Washington. I have not a friend in Washington whom it will affect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry, I have not the time.

It does not affect me in any particular. If any of you want it on the statute books to affect the 500,000 people living here, all right. I am going to vote against this bill and against the Sisson bill, and try to get a roll call on both.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the rule.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNOR) there were 49 ayes and 50 noes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 198, nays 89, answered "present" 1, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—198

Amle	Barry	Boileau	Buck
Ayers	Belter	Boland	Buckler, Minn.
Bacharach	Biermann	Boylan	Burch
Bankhead	Bland	Brewster	Burdick
Barden	Boehne	Brown, Ga.	Carmichael

Cartwright	Gillette	McSwain
Casey	Gingery	Maloney
Chandler	Granfield	Mansfield
Chapman	Gray, Ind.	Marcantonio
Citron	Green	Martin, Colo.
Cochran	Greenway	Mason
Colden	Greever	Massingale
Cole, N. Y.	Gwynne	Mead
Connery	Hamlin	Meeks
Cooley	Harter	Merritt, N. Y.
Costello	Hennings	Miller
Cox	Higgins, Mass.	Mitchell, Ill.
Cravens	Hildebrandt	Mitchell, Tenn.
Creal	Hill, Samuel B.	Moran
Crosser, Ohio	Hook	Murdock
Crowe	Houston	Nelson
Cullen	Huddleston	Nichols
Cummings	Hull	Norton
Curley	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Connell
Daly	Johnson, Tex.	O'Connor
Deen	Johnson, W. Va.	O'Leary
Dempsey	Jones	O'Neal
Dies	Kahn	Owen
Dockweiler	Kennedy, Md.	Patterson
Dorsey	Kennedy, N. Y.	Patton
Doughton	Kenney	Pearson
Doxey	Kloeb	Pfeifer
Drewry	Kniffin	Pittenger
Driscoll	Kramer	Polk
Driver	Kvale	Quinn
Duffy, N. Y.	Lambertson	Ramsay
Eckert	Lambeth	Ramspeck
Edmiston	Lanham	Randolph
Elcher	Lee, Okla.	Rayburn
Ellenbogen	Lemke	Reilly
Evans	Lesinski	Richards
Fletcher	Lewis, Colo.	Richardson
Ford, Calif.	Lewis, Md.	Robertson
Frey	Ludlow	Robinson, Utah
Fuller	McClellan	Rogers, Mass.
Gasque	McCormack	Rogers, N. H.
Gassaway	McGehee	Rogers, Okla.
Gehrman	McLean	Russell
Gilchrist	McLeod	Ryan
Gildea	McReynolds	Sabath

NAYS—89

Andresen	Englebright	Luckey	Robson, Ky.
Andrew, Mass.	Fiesinger	Maas	Sanders, Tex.
Andrews, N. Y.	Flannagan	Main	Scruggam
Arends	Ford, Miss.	Mapes	Sears
Ashbrook	Fulmer	Martin, Mass.	Short
Bacon	Gambrell	May	Snell
Binderup	Goldsborough	Merritt, Conn.	Stefan
Blackney	Guyer	Michener	Stewart
Blanton	Haines	Mott	Taber
Bolton	Halleck	O'Malley	Tarver
Caldwell	Hancock, N. Y.	Parsons	Taylor, S. C.
Cannon, Mo.	Hess	Patman	Thurston
Carlson	Higgins, Conn.	Peterson, Fla.	Tinkham
Castellow	Hill, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.	Tobey
Church	Hoffman	Pettengill	Turner
Coffee	Hollister	Pierce	Turpin
Cole, Md.	Holmes	Powers	Vinson, Ga.
Colmer	Hope	Rankin	Whelchel
Cooper, Tenn.	Jacobsen	Ransley	Wolcott
Crawford	Kinzer	Reece	Woodruff
Crowther	Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	
Dondero	Lamneck	Rich	
Ekwall	Lord	Risk	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Dobbins

NOT VOTING—140

Adair	Darden	Gray, Pa.	McKeough
Allen	Darrow	Greenwood	McLaughlin
Beam	Dear	Gregory	McMillan
Bell	Delaney	Griswold	Mahon
Berlin	DeRouen	Hancock, N. C.	Marshall
Bloom	Dickstein	Harlan	Maverick
Boykin	Dietrich	Hart	Millard
Brennan	Dingell	Hartley	Monaghan
Brooks	Dirksen	Healey	Montague
Brown, Mich.	Disney	Hill, Knute	Montet
Buchanan	Ditter	Hobbs	Moritz
Buckbee	Doutrich	Hoeppel	O'Brien
Buckley, N. Y.	Duffey, Ohio	Imhoff	O'Day
Bulwinkle	Duncan	Jenkins, Ohio	Oliver
Burnham	Dunn, Miss.	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano
Cannon, Wls.	Dunn, Pa.	Kee	Parks
Carpenter	Eagle	Keller	Perkins
Carter	Eaton	Kelly	Peyser
Cary	Engel	Kerr	Plumley
Cavicchia	Faddis	Kleberg	Rabaut
Celler	Farley	Kocalkowski	Reed, Ill.
Christianson	Fenerty	Kopplemann	Romjue
Claiborne	Ferguson	Larabee	Sadowski
Clark, Idaho	Fernandez	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, La.
Clark, N. C.	Fish	Leibach	Schaefer
Collins	Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Schuetz
Cooper, Ohio	Focht	Lundeen	Shanley
Corning	Gavagan	McAndrews	Sirovich
Crosby	Gearhart	McFarlane	Snyder, Pa.
Cross, Tex.	Gifford	McGrath	Somers, N. Y.
Culkin	Goodwin	McGroarty	Stack

Starnes	Taylor, Tenn.	Wallgren	Wilson, Pa.
Steagall	Thomas	Wigglesworth	Withrow
Summers, Tex.	Treadway	Wilcox	Wolfenden
Taylor, Colo.	Wadsworth	Wilson, La.	Wolverton

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

On the vote:

Mr. Maverick (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
 Mrs. O'Day (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
 Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Wigglesworth (against).
 Mr. Duffey of Ohio (for) with Mr. Shanley (against).
 Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Wolfenden (against).
 Mr. Sadowski (for) with Mr. Focht (against).
 Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Kleberg (against).
 Mr. Knute Hill (for) with Mr. Allen (against).
 Mr. Wolverton (for) with Mr. Culin (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Gifford.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Parks with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
 Mr. Eagle with Mr. Lehlbach.
 Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Goodwin.
 Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
 Mr. McFarlane with Mr. Millard.
 Mr. Kerr with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Plumley.
 Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Marshall.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Burnham.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Bloom with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Kelly with Mr. Christianson.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Withrow.
 Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania with Mr. Engel.
 Mr. Beam with Mr. Buckbee.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Cavichia.
 Mr. Starnes with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Fenerty.
 Mr. Cary with Mr. Lundeen.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Gearhart.
 Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Wallgren.
 Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania with Mr. Somers of New York.
 Mr. Moritz with Mr. O'Brien.
 Mr. Peyser with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Darden with Mr. McLaughlin.
 Mr. Wilson of Louisiana with Mr. Claiborne.
 Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Harlan with Mr. Oliver.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Hart.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Stack.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. McKeough.
 Mr. Brennan with Mr. Healey.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Larrabee.
 Mr. Crosby with Mr. Kocialkowski.
 Mr. Keller with Mr. Monaghan.
 Mr. Farley with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Schuetz.
 Mr. McGrath with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Duncan.
 Mr. Faddis with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Dietrich with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Dear.
 Mr. Clark of Idaho with Mr. Carpenter.

Mr. COX changed his vote from "present" to "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under the resolution the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. UMSTEAD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule provides that the bill shall be considered as having been read the second time. Amendments are now in order, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, strike out lines 15 and 16.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, section 24 is obviously a mistake in the bill and should be stricken out. I do not think any argument is necessary, and I ask for a vote.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I think this is a bad amendment. I think the provision should stay in the bill. It says:

The right to alter, amend, or repeal any provision of this act is hereby reserved to the Congress.

That is where the right should be, and not with this bunch of Commissioners. We take the responsibility and they take the credit. We take the criticism and they proceed to help themselves and take the credit for every good thing we do. It is time that that was stopped. I do not care what the House does. I do not think it accidentally got into the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ZIONCHECK) there were 58 ayes and 1 no.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following privileged amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause of the bill be stricken out.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect the motion to pass, but I would feel recreant to my duty if I did not offer it.

The rules of the House provide that where Members believe a bill is bad, they have a right, under the rules, to offer such a motion to strike out the enacting clause. I have felt that I would be recreant to my duty if I did not pursue every possible means afforded by the rules of the House to stop such a bad bill, which even a member of the Rules Committee, Judge Cox, of Georgia, says is unconstitutional, communistic, outrageous, and worse than anything that has ever come out of Russia.

I want to call attention to one peculiar situation. There were, with the chairman, about 100 of us here who heard the debate on the rule. After hearing the debate, notwithstanding the prestige of the Committee on Rules behind the rule, the membership who heard the debate voted 49 for the rule and 50 against it, a majority against it, forcing the Rules Committee chairman to make a point of no quorum, to get a roll call. That was worth \$1,000 of anybody's money, to see and to realize that you could still have confidence in the judgment of the Members of the House if they were present and heard what was going on. The 50 against were the ones who had been present and had heard what was going on. They heard Judge Cox's statement about this bill being communistic and unconstitutional. They saw the ridiculous rule which stopped all general debate, although it was not concluded, and which waived all points of order against the bill, and prevented the usual second reading of the bill for amendments.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am sorry—which rule said that the bill was already read when it had not been read for amendment. Just by a Thurston magician wave of the hand, ipso facto, under the rule the bill had been read—and which said that all amendments presented had to be debated in an hour and a half—and most of the time under the rules would be under the control of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, whenever she should demand recognition. When the membership listening here on the floor understood that ridiculous rule a majority voted against it, and the greatest thing that ever happened was to have the chairman of the great Committee on Rules forced in a situation like that, after he had been talking against points of no quorum and roll calls, to have to get up and say, "Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote because a quorum is not present, and I want a quorum here", and thus stop the business of the House! He had the members of the Ways and Means Committee leave their committee so as to come here and he had the members of all of the other committees that were busy come here and vote on something they did not know anything about, as they had not heard the debate, and naturally they passed the rule.

I do not care what you do with this motion. I have done my full duty. I am going to vote to strike out its enacting clause as a first chance to kill the bill, and then I am going to vote against the bill, and I hope we will be able to force the chairman to make the point of no quorum, so as to have a roll call on it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly I yield to my genial friend from Georgia, who gave one of the finest pronunciamientos possible against the bill.

Mr. COX. What is the difference in effect in supporting the gentleman's amendment and waiting finally to vote on the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. My motion forces a quick, decisive vote. Oh, the gentleman's committee was in such a hurry to bring expedition on the passage of a bill which he says is infamous, communistic, and unconstitutional that I wanted to help him expedite the matter. This is really a vote on the bill. If you vote for this motion you kill the bill right now. But, of course, it will not pass. But when we vote on the passage of the bill I believe there will be enough votes against it to kill it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has not stated the facts. The bill was read, and the time for general debate was concluded. The only purpose of bringing in this rule was to prevent another filibuster on the passage of the bill.

Several times the unconstitutionality of this bill has been suggested, and several times the House has been told that the Supreme Court of the United States has upheld the rent commission bill. I wish to quote now from the case of Block, trading under the name of White, against Hirsch, argued before the District Supreme Court March 3, 1921, and decided on April 18, 1921. This is quite a long argument, and it would be impossible for me to quote it in full in this short time. The court held that the legislative declaration of facts afforded a ground for the regulation and that the regulation was justified as a temporary measure, even though it might not be as a permanent change, and that is all we ask in this bill. That it remain in effect until the emergency terminates. There is one-half of 1 percent vacancies in the District; surely that constitutes an emergency. Again, Mr. Chairman, before the Supreme Court of New York there was a similar decision rendered, and so I think if the lawyers in this House will take these two decisions under consideration they will find that this is absolutely a constitutional bill.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I have not the time; I am sorry.

Mr. DOBBINS. For just a brief inquiry.

Mrs. NORTON. Very well.

Mr. DOBBINS. Was not the legislative declaration of fact to which the lady referred a declaration of necessity growing out of the World War, and did not the Supreme Court say that it took notice of that fact?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. DOBBINS. Is not that true, that the legislative declaration of fact grew out of the World War, and the Supreme Court took notice of it?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; and there is an emergency here now—a very great emergency.

Mr. DOBBINS. There is always an emergency.

Mrs. NORTON. There is a great emergency now. We have only one-half of 1 percent of vacancies in this District. Surely that constitutes an emergency, and the hundreds of letters I have received from tenants throughout the District supports the fact of an emergency.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTE. The gentlewoman has heard the statement made on the floor that the bill was communistic. Since when has it become communistic to try to lower the rents for the people of the District of Columbia or any other place in the United States? Can the gentlewoman explain that?

Mrs. NORTON. Of course, such a statement is absurd, but it is in line with many statements that have been made with regard to this bill. I should say that if the rents in the District of Columbia continue to soar as they have during

the past few years it will bring about a communistic condition in the District. We are trying to prevent communism—not to bring it about.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the motion of the gentleman from Texas will be rejected. It is simply another method of trying to defeat this bill. If the membership of this House knew how acutely the people of this District are suffering as a result of the exorbitant rents and of the tremendous lobby of real-estate people in the District, I say to you they would certainly defeat this motion. They would not allow the ridiculous charge of communism to be used to influence and confuse the issues involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, as to whether or not, if it were not for the provision in the rule waiving the second reading of the bill for amendment, it would be necessary to have that bill read?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The point of order is that the gentleman's remarks do not bear upon a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Washington that he has not stated a point of order. The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman not having stated a proper point of order, I desire to ask the Chair whether or not that will appear in the middle of my remarks.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The Chair having ruled that the gentleman from Washington did not state a proper point of order, I will ask, under the ruling of Mr. Speaker BYRNS, if this interruption does not go out of my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Washington stated a point of order, but the Chair overruled the point of order and did not hold it in order. The Chair, therefore, rules that the gentleman's remarks would be entitled to appear in the Record at the proper place where they occurred in the Record.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I would like to repropound my parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to ask the Chair whether or not, but for the provision in the rule which waives the second reading of the bill for amendment—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. At this time I renew my point of order. I want the Chair to rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overruled the gentleman's point of order, and does so again.

The gentleman from Texas will proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. So that my parliamentary inquiry may not be "squirted up", I will ask it again.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask whether or not, but for the provision in the rule which waives the second reading of the bill for amendment, it is a fact that this bill would have to be read a second time by the Clerk for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is correct. If the resolution had not been adopted, under the normal procedure this bill would have been read for amendment in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BLANTON. Then my statement previously made was correct, and the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey should not have said that I made an incorrect statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not undertaking to rule on the correctness of the statement to which the gentleman refers. The Chair ruled on the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry.

The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If the contention of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is correct, do we understand there will be no reading of the bill under the 5-minute rule in Committee of the Whole, and therefore no opportunity for amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that, under the plain language of the rule, the bill will not be read in Committee of the Whole, but that for a period of one hour and a half amendments may be offered and discussed, and thereafter any amendment which is offered will be considered and voted upon by the Committee without debate.

Mr. O'MALLEY. But only such amendments which may be offered within that time will be in order. Is that true?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair just stated to the gentleman from Wisconsin that, although debate on amendments would not continue for more than one hour and a half, all amendments offered to any section of the bill will be in order and will be voted upon by the Committee under the plain language of the rule.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were ayes 36 and noes 56.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "Congress" on page 24, line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to advise the gentleman that that is already out of the bill. It is included in an amendment which has already been adopted by the committee.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out line 19, worded as follows:

SEC. 26. This act shall take effect immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ZIONCHECK offers to amend the bill, on page 24, by striking out all of line 19.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to revise and extend my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time that I be allowed to talk out of order if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to make a specific request before the Chair can present the request to the House.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. As long as no one objects to it, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The request has not been put to the House and cannot be until the gentleman makes it specific.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill. My reasons are very elemental, but I think they are sound. I am satisfied this commission will not do much. It will be another commission; but they cannot do any harm, because the real-estate sharks and the landlords and bankers in Washington, D. C., are getting all the money they can from the people now; so if they try to increase the rents, it will be a useless gesture, because they cannot get the money.

You know there are very fine landlords in the District of Columbia. You will remember that when the 15-percent Economy Act went into effect the landlords even told the Government employees who were renting from them that they were awfully sorry. They even cried crocodile tears, but they did not reduce their rent. When, however, the 10-percent restoration of salary went into effect the landlords, with firmness but gentleness, informed many of their tenants that the rent would be increased 25 percent of the 10 percent. They were entitled to it! Very decent of them!

I take the position that this commission cannot do anything worse; and if they do not do anything worse, the situation cannot be any worse; but they may make it a little

better; they may accidentally stumble onto a matter where some of the colored people down here might have electric lights in their homes instead of coal-oil lamps or lard buckets with wicks in them. They might accidentally suggest to the District health officers that they could breed smaller cockroaches; and you know those other things that run around make a lot of noise at night, and if you put a bag in their way they kick it aside and get annoyed. Maybe that is the reason the gentleman from Texas voted against the death sentence.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman not quote me. I voted for the death sentence.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But the gentleman talked against it and voted against it until he got on record, and then he changed his vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will suspend a moment.

The Chair wishes to state to the gentleman from Texas that it is contrary to the rule to interrupt a speaker without first addressing the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask whether or not the gentleman has a right to say I voted against the death sentence when I voted for it—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I have the right to tell the truth.

Mr. BLANTON. And leave me in a false attitude here before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not undertaking to rule on what rights the gentleman on the floor has, but the gentleman from Texas is well aware, of course, that he has no right under the rules to speak from his seat.

The gentleman from Washington will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, this morning my attention was invited or drawn to a little editorial in the Washington Post.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman understood—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will suspend. The gentleman from Texas will state the point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the rules of the House the gentleman is restricted to striking out the specific language mentioned in his amendment and must confine his debate to the amendment; that he has no right to indulge in personalities against me here which, my colleagues understand fully well why, I cannot resent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must discuss the matter contained in his amendment. The gentleman from Washington will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is that I disagree with the inference that the gentleman from Texas has not gentlemanly instincts.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is not conforming to the ruling of the Chair or to the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington, under the ruling of the Chair—and the Chair is sure the gentleman understood it—must discuss the subject matter of his amendment, and will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, what was the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offered the amendment. The Chair did not hear it read, but presumes the gentleman knows what is in his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I offered an amendment to strike out the language "this act shall take effect immediately."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must confine himself to the language of his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. So I contend, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Texas has gentlemanly instincts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the last statement made by the gentleman was in viola-

tion of the ruling of the Chair and in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The time of the gentleman from Washington had expired and the Chair had so announced before the gentleman from Texas made his point of order. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington would strike out section 26, which provides that this act shall take effect immediately. I am opposed to the amendment because I believe that the act should take effect immediately.

Mr. Chairman, my reason for making this statement is that as chairman of a select committee of this House I have been investigating the real-estate securities and the default in these securities, which amounts to close to \$20,000,000,000, and your committee has obtained considerable evidence.

This select committee of the House after 18 months of investigation has obtained evidence showing that property in the District of Columbia suffered less than any other in the United States. The owners, companies, and corporations who have built and control hundreds of these apartment buildings and hotels, though in many instances I admit the original bond issues were excessive, as in the Smith and other cases, nevertheless the investigation on the part of the Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganization disclosed that the occupancy even in the worst years—under the Republican administration in 1931, 1932, and the first part of 1933—was nearly 80 percent; and the agents and owners in very few instances reduced the rentals, and then only a small percent. This, notwithstanding the fact that the taxes are lower in Washington than in any other city in the United States, with janitor and other employee services at the lowest wage scale, and with cost of upkeep and maintenance at the lowest figure, and yet these property owners in the city of Washington permitted their mortgages and bonds to go in default, failing in many instances to pay taxes and interest, saying nothing about their failure to pay the portions of principal when due. The withholding of the payment of these obligations was deliberate and brought about defaults, with the resulting foreclosures, which enabled them to acquire the outstanding bonds.

This shameful manipulation and failure to pay just obligations made possible their acquiring bonds, in many instances, as low as 5 cents on the dollar. So today hundreds of apartment buildings in Washington cost the present owners 25 percent of the original cost or the amount of the original bond issue. Still, the owners continue to increase their rentals to pay from 8 percent to 10 percent on the original investment. As they have been able to acquire the outstanding bonds, as I have stated, at such low prices, these properties net them as much as 25 percent or more, which I consider exorbitant, unfair, and unjustifiable.

It is for that reason that I feel that this legislation is in the right direction; that the commission which will be created will be able to bring about adjustment in rents which I know will be fair to the landlords and owners and which the tenants will be able to pay. We have in the city of Washington in the neighborhood of 50,000 Government employees, including our own clerks and Capitol employees, whose average salary, I understand, is \$133 a month, of which they are obliged to pay out nearly one-half for living quarters. There are thousands of other people living in Washington whose earnings as clerks in stores and offices are below \$100 a month who find it impossible to obtain decent quarters to live in. I feel that these conditions should not be tolerated, and simple justice demands that not only the Government employees but all the residents of Washington should be protected from the unscrupulous real-estate people of this city. I want it understood that I stand for the property owner to receive a fair rent to take care of his taxes, amortization, upkeep, and repairs, and

from 6 percent to 8 percent return on his money. It is outrageous and unfair that we should permit manipulators to exact tribute out of all proportion to their investments.

Mr. Chairman, the bondholders have been taken advantage of. The tenants have been taken advantage of.

The property owners who have increased their rents are not entitled to consideration from the Members of this House; and I know, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], who is always desirous of being of service to the people, knew the conditions as I know them to be, he would not oppose the bill, but, on the contrary, would favor the bill. After all, no harm can be done and a great deal of good may be accomplished.

Mr. EKWALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. EKWALL. Is this bill a bill to increase rents or just to investigate the rent situation here in the District?

Mr. SABATH. If the conditions are investigated as thoroughly as I believe they will be, it will be shown that the rents charged are excessive.

Mr. Chairman, I am under the impression that this bill will tend to reduce rents and still leave the property owners and the investors more than a fair profit on the money which they have invested. I feel that the bill should be passed and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington should be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the amendment which I submitted be withdrawn, because it was a facetious or a pro-forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in personal controversies. I have never engaged in any, and I hope I never shall. I do not believe in calling names. It has been stated by the gentleman from Georgia that this bill is socialistic. I think if the gentleman had studied and analyzed the bill and had reflected on the matter he would not have made such an amazing statement. This statement is so far from the facts and so utterly unrelated to the bill that there is no need even to discuss it.

Mr. Chairman, what does the bill do? The bill simply says that a landlord in the city of Washington shall be allowed to receive a fair return on the fair value of his property. If that is communistic, every public utility law in every State of the Union is likewise communistic. It is no more nor less than the provision that is contained in every public service law in nearly every State in the Union. I do not know whether the State of Georgia has such a law, but I believe the State of Texas has this law.

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. For a brief question, I shall be very pleased to yield.

Mr. EKWALL. Why would it not be a good idea, according to the theory of the gentleman, to apply this to all homes and all property all over the United States, if it is not communistic?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Because it is not justified, I will say to the gentleman. I do not favor this except in an extreme emergency, and we now have such an emergency in the District of Columbia, where you are unable to secure property at a fair rent. The District of Columbia is in a peculiar position.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman mentioned me and my State, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. No; I do not yield. I am sorry.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman mentioned my State.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I cannot yield, as I do not have the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to the fact that under the

rules of the House it is proper to address the Chair before interrupting the gentleman who has the floor.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, he is still doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is violating the same rule.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will not my colleague from Pennsylvania yield for a correction?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes in addition to the 5 minutes, and if this request is granted, I shall be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I shall be very pleased to yield, Mr. Chairman, to my distinguished colleague from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Pennsylvania stated that my State of Texas passed such a rent-control law.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. A public-utilities law.

Mr. BLANTON. A former Governor of Texas, named Ferguson, had a rent-control law passed, and the Supreme Court of Texas held that it was absolutely unconstitutional.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Then the constitution of Texas must have provisions that are not contained in most of the other constitutions.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I will be pleased to yield later, and I hope I shall have the time to yield.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Not at this time. I want a few minutes to make my statement, and then I shall be pleased to yield.

The only thing this proposed law states is that a landlord shall not charge excessive rent. It does not take his property, it does not appropriate his property, it does not apply to any home owner who owns and lives in his own home. It only applies to those who rent their homes to others, and in those cases it says that the commission shall fix a fair return upon a fair value.

Now, the United States Supreme Court has said time and again that public-service laws are constitutional.

I am not in favor of a permanent rent-control law, but while we have an emergency we should have this law. It does not apply to any other part of the country, and should not apply, because you do not have to go anywhere else, but the people must come to the city of Washington if the Government calls them here for the purpose of taking a position. They have no choice in the matter, and they should be protected in their living conditions, otherwise they cannot come here and give their services.

I may say further, Mr. Chairman, that under the terms of this bill the law is limited to 3 years because we feel that within that time the overcrowded condition in the city of Washington should certainly disappear.

The Supreme Court has held a similar bill constitutional in the case of Block against Hirsch, which has been referred to, and which is reported in Two Hundred and Fifty-sixth United States Supreme Court Reports, and also held a similar law of the State of New York constitutional, which is reported in the same volume.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I am sorry, but I do not have the time. A little later I shall be very happy to yield if I have the time.

Now, this bill has been stated to be connected with the Sisson bill. This statement, of course, is ridiculous. This bill was introduced long before the Sisson bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DOBBINS and Mr. ZIONCHECK rose.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. DOBBINS and Mr. ZIONCHECK objected.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, at this time for the purpose of propounding to the gentleman from Pennsylvania the inquiry which he regrettably did not find the time to hear during his argument. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will entertain the inquiry now, I will ask it in my own time.

The gentleman stated that the purpose of this bill is to guarantee to landlords a fair rental, as well as to the tenant. Under the terms of this bill, as I understand them, if a landlord executes a lease at a certain rental, let us say at \$50 a month, and determines the next day he has charged too little in that lease and that the property is worth \$100 a month, he has the right, under this bill, to file a petition with the Rent Commission to repudiate his lease and ask to have the larger rent allowed him. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield for the purpose of a reply from the gentleman.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. It certainly would be ridiculous for the Commission to permit such a proceeding.

Mr. DOBBINS. It is permissible, under the bill, is it not?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The bill is framed like all rent-control laws, and provides that the tenant may come in and say that the rent charged is excessive.

Mr. DOBBINS. And may not the landlord likewise say that it is unfair?

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. The landlord does not need to come in, because he has the power to enter into any lease and can collect any rent he desires, if the tenant does not file a complaint objecting to the lease.

Mr. DOBBINS. The inquiry permits the owner or the tenant, on their own initiative, to direct it solely to the question whether the rent is adequate and the terms of the lease are fair. The old law, which, it has been said, is identical with the present one, did not permit that inquiry to be made during the pendency of the lease.

This bill permits an inquiry to be instituted by the tenant or by the owner, as will be found on lines 11, 12, and 13, page 8:

Notwithstanding the existence of a lease or other contract between the tenant and the owner or between the owner or any guest.

It provides that a man can go and secure a lease and the next day go to the chairman of this commission and ask that the terms of the lease be re-formed.

Suppose two or three individuals want the same piece of property, that none of them wants to pay the landlord's price, that two are too honorable to make an agreement with the undisclosed purpose of repudiating it, but the third agrees to pay the price, and then the next day goes to the chairman of this commission and asks to have the terms reduced as being unfair. Is there any fairness in a bill that invites duplicity of that sort?

My objection to this is that it encourages double dealing and repudiation. It is not a bill for fair dealing, but it is a bill for double dealing. It ought to be voted down by all Members of the House who believe in fair dealing. It is also unconstitutional beyond all doubt.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language in this bill he just read is in the law passed by Congress May 22.

Mr. DOBBINS. Certainly the 1922 amendment could not have been considered by the Supreme Court in a case that came before the courts in 1919.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Illinois has properly stated that this bill is undoubtedly unconstitutional. In view of the Democratic platform, is it not also undemocratic?

Mr. DOBBINS. It is undoubtedly undemocratic and unconstitutional, and the bureaucracy it provides for would be perpetual.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words on page 1 of the bill starting with the word "District", in line 6, and ending with the word "persons", in line 9, the words being as follows:

District of Columbia dangerous to the general welfare, health, peace, and morals of the public and to public officers and public employees whose duties require them to reside within the District, and other persons.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman to withhold his amendment for a moment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. A pro-forma amendment is pending. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offered an amendment and the gentleman from Illinois spoke in opposition to the amendment. That amendment is now pending.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous-consent request to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw the pro-forma amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I now renew the amendment which I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ZIONCHECK: Page 1, line 6, beginning with the words "District of Columbia", strike out the remainder of line 6 and all of lines 7, 8, and 9.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, there has been a bad rumor running around the town that the reason the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] objects to this bill is that he is a landlord.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately conditions are such that I cannot resent these personalities, and I make the point of order that the gentleman from Washington in discussing the amendment such as he has offered has no right to engage in personalities under the rules of the House.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order, and rules that the point of order is well taken. The gentleman from Washington will confine his remarks to the amendment which he offered and avoid personalities, and please proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I think if the Chairman reads that amendment and knows what I am trying to strike out he will see that I am in order. It seems that there is a house out here—let us see, 1851 Irving Street NW., square 2598, lot 75, upon which there is a house. That house was purchased in the District of Columbia, I think, on December 31, 1924. It was purchased from Allie L. Douglas and transferred to May Matthews Blanton on that date, and it was recorded the next day. May Matthews Blanton—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Does not the gentleman want the facts? I do not know whether that is true or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will suspend. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, but for the conditions that prevent me from resenting these personalities, I would not under any circumstances allow the gentleman from Washington to even mention my wife's name.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Understand, I do not know that this is your wife.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Washington again that he must confine his remarks to the amendment which he has offered, and that he cannot indulge in personalities.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair hopes that the gentleman will respect the rules of the House and will not continue to indulge in personalities.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I am going to proceed strictly in order. May Matthews Blanton transferred to—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that the gentleman is not discussing his amendment, and I make the point of order that the gentleman must confine himself to his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will suspend while the point of order is being stated by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that under the rules of the House the one making the amendment must confine his discussion to his amendment, and has no right to bring in any extraneous matters in his argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair again sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. May I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already ruled on the point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The next time I want to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say to the gentleman from Washington again that he hopes he will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. Or else take his seat.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, on the next point of order I want to be heard. I am going to explain that this is very pertinent to the amendment that I have offered, but I want to be heard next time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman from Washington that it is within the discretion of the Chair as to what the Chair will hear on a point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And may I state to the Chair that when I am properly heard on this there can be no discretion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. To R. Q. Lee, the deed dated December 10—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is violating the rules of the House, violating the ruling of the Chair thrice repeated to him, that he cannot discuss outside, personal matters on an amendment to strike out language such as the gentleman made.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order? I am serious in this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas raises a point of order. Will the gentleman repeat the language that he understood the gentleman from Washington to use, to which he refers?

Mr. BLANTON. In this argument the gentleman from Washington was attempting to engage in personalities by first stating that I was a landlord when I was not; second, by bringing in my wife's name.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is referring to the last point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas. The Chair did not hear the language used by the gentleman from Washington, and therefore is unable to rule.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Washington was repeating about some deed that was made to R. Q. Lee at a certain date.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Who was R. Q. Lee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the point of order is sustained, and the gentleman from Washington will either proceed in order or the gentleman from Washington will take his seat.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. R. Q. Lee was a former Member of Congress from Texas—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that, in continued violation of the rulings of the Chair, the gentleman from Washington proceeds to discuss outside, personal matters.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I would like to hear the ruling out of the book this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington state to the Chair the statement he made just prior to the moment the gentleman from Texas addressed the Chair?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. In other words, why I feel that this is pertinent?

The CHAIRMAN. No. That is not what the Chair asked the gentleman. The Chair asked the gentleman to repeat the brief statement he made just prior to the time the gentleman from Texas stated his point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I have made so many that I do not know to which one the Chair is referring.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I think the Clerk could read that and have it correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will suspend. Will the reporter submit to the Chair the language upon which the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas was based?

(The remarks of Mr. ZIONCHECK were submitted to the Chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas as to the particular language referred to in that point of order. The Chair wishes, however, to again say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] that he must confine his statement to the language of his amendment, and if the gentleman insists upon making further personal references he will be compelled to take his seat.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] has the floor. Does the gentleman from Washington yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. No.

Mr. NICHOLS. For a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Oh, yes. I yield for that.

Mr. NICHOLS. I desire to ask the Chair whether or not the Members of the House are not presumed to be advised of the language used by a Member addressing the House when a point of order is raised against the language. I do not think there is any Member of the House who knows what is contained in the language which the Chair has before him, and we would like to be advised what that is.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I would like to find out, too. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] that the Chair examined the language taken down by the Official Reporter and ruled upon that language, based upon the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] will proceed in order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. R. Q. Lee evidently died and his widow and heirs transferred it—referring to the property—to George M. Marx. I am very glad this happened in 1900 and something, or otherwise people might think it was Karl Marx. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. MEAD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending before the committee, offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK].

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I object, whatever it is. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington objects to the withdrawal of his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. O Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment may be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn. Is there objection?

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, I object; and I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAIN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those occasions when we are likely to allow our emotions to supersede the dictates of our intelligence.

I grant you that many of us, coming into the city of Washington, resent what appears to be the mercenary gouging of Washington landlords. I grant you that many of us do not approve of the tactics which have been adopted—the parliamentary procedure which has been followed—in trying to block consideration of this bill; but I would appeal to the Members of the House not to let these considerations actuate them when it comes to voting upon this important piece of legislation.

I had the experience while engaged in the practice of law of being beaten on both sides of a State law which is typical of laws in many of the States, namely a mortgage-moratorium law. For this reason I feel very keenly about the decision made by the Supreme Court of the United States in what is known as the Home Building & Loan Association against Blaisdell, decided by the Court in Two Hundred and Ninetieth United States Reports, at page 398. That case was decided quite largely upon the decision which preceded in the case known as *Block v. Hirsch* (256 U. S. 135). Block against Hirsch was a case growing out of a previous rent-commission law in the District of Columbia. These two very important decisions of our Supreme Court revolve around the word "emergency." Mr. Chairman, I do not find that the proponents of this bill have taken the trouble—perhaps they did not dare in this type of legislation—to declare that an emergency does exist; and I undertake to say that our Court will not take judicial notice of an emergency such as is assumed by the advocates of this measure.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman is not confining his remarks to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan will proceed in order.

Mr. MAIN. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that anything is in order which relates to the constitutionality of the measure, and I am addressing myself directly to the constitutionality of the proposed law.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAIN. I decline to yield, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I may say that the drafters of the bill under consideration have indirectly referred to an assumed emergency; but again I repeat the assertion that our court will not take judicial notice of an emergency such as they seem to assume does exist. They declare or speak of a "war against the depression." We all know this language is merely a play upon the word "war" and that such an emergency does not exist in the sense in which it is used in this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I think lawyers and students of the Constitution recognize that the case of Block against Hirsch was a border-line case. Certainly the case of Home Building & Loan Association against Blaisdell was an extreme border-line case. In my humble opinion, Mr. Chairman, these two cases will come up repeatedly to plague the legal profession and the distinguished jurists across the plaza who gave these two cases the sanction of their judicial determination. Hard cases make bad law, and I appeal to the Members of the House not to fall into the error of enacting another bad law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my pro forma amendment, which was not seriously intended, may be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEAD: Page 23, line 2, after the word "thereof", insert a new section, as follows:

"The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to complete a study of the Federal Government's building requirements in the District of Columbia and to submit a report of such findings to the Congress not later than January 15, 1937. In their report to Congress the Commission may recommend the transfer of Federal agencies from the District of Columbia to other parts of the United States."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. MEAD. Will not the gentleman withhold his point of order until I complete my observation?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all serious in attempting to amend the bill by the addition of the language just read by the Clerk. More important is my desire to bring to your attention the uneven growth of the Capital of the Nation, with the recurring emergency demands which result from that uneven and rather hasty development. A capital city expands without restraint as bureaucracy in government increases, and Washington is found to be larger each decade since it became the Capital of the Nation. Washington will be larger 10 years from now than it is today. No matter how we may rail against bureaucracy and the concentration of industrial organizations, Government will increase and expand, and with the expansion of the Government will come the expansion of its Capital facilities. The largest growth of a capital city, however, comes about during wartime or when we are called upon to endure a depressive period.

My idea in suggesting this amendment is to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that there has developed in the Capital City much of the activities of Government which could be decentralized and efficiently administered in other sections of the country. The Post Office Department, for example, in each State, or in each of the several postal districts of the country, has a central accounting office with jurisdiction over all the postal activities in that area. Yet here we find the Agricultural Department utilizing land that should be left for real estate in maintaining an experimental farm.

I hope the Commission that was created to locate an airport site will go outside the District of Columbia and stop the congestion resulting from the location of too many facilities within the District.

I want to say to begin with that I am friendly to this legislation, and I want to pay my respects to the chairman of this committee for her diligence, her patience, and her sincerity of purpose, exemplified by her actions since the very beginning of the consideration of the bill in the House earlier in the session.

We have concentrated in the District of Columbia too many of the facilities of Government. We have, for example, the Walter Reed Hospital, bringing patients from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and all over the eastern section of the United States to the District; and, in addition to that, we have another veterans' hospital known as the Mount Alto Hospital. We have St. Elizabeths Hospital, and we have a Naval Hospital in the District that is expanding very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. Is it not true that we are decentralizing the departments to some extent, especially through the Agricultural Department? Is it not true that they are now making arrangements to have the various acts of Congress enforced in each State capital?

Mr. MEAD. Decentralization comes and goes according to the likes and dislikes of the particular department or bureau

head. It may now be fashionable in the Department of Agriculture; 5 years from now it may not be so. But it does seem to me that some survey board ought to be instituted and a definite policy brought forth by the Congress and adopted in this regard. No harm will come to the business of the District if in the further expansion of Federal activities some consideration is given to communities outside the District of Columbia.

May I remind you that only the other day, on the anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, great emphasis was laid on some of his philosophies. Thomas Jefferson stated that he was opposed to the growth of bureaucracy, and maintained that a democracy would live and prosper in a nation of smaller communities rather than in the building up of teeming, populous centers. Yet, as a result of the overgrowth of one of our cities, the Capital City of the United States, we must increase bureaucracy by creating a commission that would be unnecessary were it not for the fact that the Capital City has expanded tremendously in periods of depression and in periods of war.

I believe that the Post Office Department, the Agriculture Department, the Army, so far as Army posts are concerned, and the Navy, so far as navy yards are concerned, and the other activities of the Government, could wisely and prudently decentralize some of their facilities and give opportunity to the smaller communities in remote sections of the United States to enjoy some of the prosperity enjoyed here. This would obviate the necessity of rent commissions and it would prevent these recurring emergency periods during which some landlords gouge the tenants to a degree beyond mercy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. TABER. I do. The amendment offered by the gentleman is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words in the first section of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from New York that we should decentralize many of the offices now located in Washington. I believe that we should not only decentralize but should carry out the first plank in the platform of the party that is now in power, which I desire to read.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, with very deep regret I must make a point of order against the gentleman's remarks. They are not germane to the amendment which he has presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will proceed in order and discuss the language in his amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has not yielded.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield. I want to discuss this amendment.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The point of order is this: If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would start asking where the money is coming from, that might be germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a point of order, and the Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Washington understands that is not a point of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this bill creating another commission to regulate rents is contrary to the first plank in the platform of the Democratic Party as adopted in 1932.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I submit a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the gentleman is not discussing his amendment and is therefore not proceeding in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is unable to rule, because the Chair did not hear the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the first section of this bill states that the rent and housing conditions in the District are dangerous to the general welfare, health, peace, and morals of the public. I want to show that the health, peace, and morals of the public, if they were promoted in accordance with the first plank of the Democratic platform—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will state his point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. My point of order is that the last five words of the first section of the bill are these: "this act unless sooner repealed", and, evidently, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not speaking on his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is now discussing the first section of the bill and the Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Under the bill we are discussing at the present time, if we carried out the statement that was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD] decreasing the number of people we have in Washington by decentralizing these bureaus—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington will state his point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The point of order is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about an amendment to which a point of order was made and which was sustained by the Chair and, evidently, he cannot be right this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the first plank in the Democratic platform may be something that the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives do not want to hear, but I think if they are sincere and serious in trying to carry out the things they told the American people they would carry out, they would be glad to hear this and do the things they promised the American people they would do.

Now, the situation is just this. Stop establishing more bureaus, cut down Government employees, and the housing situation will adjust itself.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will state his point of order.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his own amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. SISSON. I have no objection to his reading the Democratic platform, if he wants to, or the Bible either.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled and has sustained the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it seems the Democrats do not want to listen to something they promised the American people. They are not interested although they should be pleased to have somebody call this to their attention, and I hope when the bill comes to a vote they will defeat it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is now a pro-forma amendment pending before the Committee. Is there objection to the withdrawing of the pending pro-forma amendment?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I am not going to object if I can get time to finish my speech, and I can finish it in 5 minutes. However, I do not object.

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: On page 8, line 11, strike out lines 11 and 12 and the words "any guest" in line 13.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, in the 3 days in which this bill has been debated there have been a number of very fine speeches made in reference to it, attacking its constitutionality, first, on the question of an emergency. Whether or not that exists, I think, is a fact that might well be left to the courts. I personally cannot determine it, and I doubt if many people here are in position to determine it on the facts.

The other point which my amendment reaches is the question raised with respect to interference with existing contracts. I believe the bill is defective in this respect. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS] made a fine address on Monday and pointed out the language which I now move to strike out. This language is, "notwithstanding the existence of a lease or other contract between the tenant and the owner or between the owner or any guest."

This, of course, is probably in violation of the Constitution as to the protection of existing contracts. I believe if this language is taken out of the bill, as it should be, most of the objections to the bill fall, and the Court can decide the question of the emergency, if it be raised.

There has been a great deal of talk here about hordes of additional employees. This is not correct, of course. They will all be under civil service, and the Appropriations Committee will take care of the appropriations in that respect.

I offer my amendment in good faith to perfect the bill from a constitutional standpoint, and I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mrs. NORTON, Mr. ZIONCHECK, and Mr. TABER rose.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment—

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New Jersey does not rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New Jersey is the chairman of the committee handling the proposed legislation. She is seeking recognition, and the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey for 2 minutes, the time remaining under the rule.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I will consume that 2 minutes if anybody does.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield the 2 minutes to me?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will yield 1 minute of the time, if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey, for the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The point of order is this; I think the parliamentary rule is—and if it is not, it should be—that the chairman of the Committee on Rules cannot take the last 5 minutes to make an amendment and then make a speech consuming all the time. I think that is not decent.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair understands the gentleman's point of order, the Chair overrules it. There is 1 minute of time left.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Chairman, then I make another point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order, and make it brief.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I do not want to argue the point. I do not want to offend the lady from New Jersey. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the gentleman from Washington has made a point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. How much time is remaining? I want to know how many are going to talk.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a point of order. The time has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. O Mr. Chairman, that comes too late. All time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules that point of order.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. What objection is there? Why does the Chair overrule the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will explain. Under the rule the time for debating amendments is limited to 1½ hours. That hour and a half has expired. The bill is now open for as many amendments as may be offered hereafter, but there will be no debate.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, if there are no other amendments, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. UMSTEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11563, and pursuant to House Resolution 489, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered under the rule. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ZIONCHECK rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes, otherwise I have a technical point upon which I can raise the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Then I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 108.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eighty-one Members present, not a quorum. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 85, nays 196, answered "present" 1, not voting 146, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—85

Amlie	Cannon, Mo.	Daly	Gehrmann
Ashbrook	Citron	Deen	Gray, Ind.
Barry	Colden	Dempsey	Gray, Pa.
Beiter	Connery	Dies	Green
Boehne	Creal	Driscoll	Greenway
Bolleau	Crosser, Ohio	Ellenbogen	Higgins, Mass.
Boland	Crowe	Evans	Hildebrandt
Boylan	Cullen	Fletcher	Houston
Buckler, Minn.	Cummings	Ford, Calif.	Huddleston
Burdick	Curley	Gassaway	Hull

Kennedy, Md.
Kennedy, N. Y.
Kenney
Kvale
Lea, Calif.
Lesinski
Lewis, Md.
Ludlow
McGehee
Marcantonio
Martin, Colo.
Mead

Merritt, N. Y.
Murdock
Nichols
Norton
O'Connell
O'Connor
O'Leary
Patton
Pfeifer
Pierce
Pittenger
Ramsay

Randolph
Reilly
Ryan
Sabath
Sauthoff
Schneider, Wis.
Schulte
Scott
Scrugham
Secrest
Sisson
Sullivan

Thom
Tony
Walter
Wearin
Weaver
Welch
White
Wood
Zioncheck

NAYS—196

Andresen
Andrew, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Ayers
Bacon
Barden
Biermann
Binderup
Blackney
Bland
Blanton
Bolton
Brewster
Brown, Ga.
Buck
Burch
Burnham
Caldwell
Carlson
Carpenter
Carter
Castellow
Chandler
Chapman
Church
Clark, Idaho
Clark, N. C.
Cochran
Coffee
Cole, Md.
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper, Tenn.
Costello
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Dear
Dobbins
Dockweller
Dondero
Dorsey
Doxey
Drewry
Driver
Duffy, N. Y.
Duncan

Eckert
Elcher
Engel
Englebright
Faddis
Fiesinger
Flannagan
Ford, Miss.
Frey
Fuller
Fulmer
Gambrell
Gasque
Gearhart
Gifford
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gingery
Goldsborough
Granfield
Guyer
Gwynne
Haines
Halleck
Hancock, N. Y.
Harlan
Harter
Hennings
Hess
Higgins, Conn.
Hill, Ala.
Hoffman
Hollister
Holmes
Hope
Jacobsen
Jenckes, Ind.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Tex.
Johnson, W. Va.
Jones
Kahn
Kinzer
Kloeb
Kniffin
Knutson
Kramer
Lambertson
Lambeth

Lamneck
Lanham
Lee, Okla.
Lewis, Colo.
Lord
Luckey
McClellan
McCormack
McLean
McLeod
McReynolds
Maas
Main
Maloney
Mapes
Martin, Mass.
Mason
Massingale
May
Meeke
Merritt, Conn.
Michener
Miller
Mitchell, Ill.
Mitchell, Tenn.
Moran
Mott
Nelson
O'Malley
O'Neal
Owen
Parsons
Patman
Patterson
Pearson
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pettengill
Polk
Powers
Ramspeck
Rankin
Ransley
Rayburn
Reece
Reed, N. Y.
Rich
Richards
Richardson

Risk
Robertson
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, N. H.
Rogers, Okla.
Russell
Sanders, Tex.
Sears
Shannon
Short
Smith, Conn.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.
Smith, W. Va.
South
Spence
Stefan
Stewart
Stubbs
Taber
Tarver
Taylor, S. C.
Taylor, Tenn.
Terry
Thomason
Thompson
Thurston
Tinkham
Tobey
Tolan
Treadway
Turner
Turpin
Umstead
Utterback
Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Warren
West
Whelchel
Whittington
Williams
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.
Wolcott
Woodrum
Young
Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hook

NOT VOTING—146

Adair
Allen
Bacharach
Bankhead
Beam
Bell
Berlin
Bloom
Boykin
Brennan
Brooks
Brown, Mich.
Buchanan
Buckbee
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Cannon, Wis.
Carmichael
Cartwright
Cary
Casey
Cavichia
Celler
Christianson
Claiborne
Collins
Cooper, Ohio
Corning
Crosby
Cross, Tex.
Crowther
Culkin
Darden
Darow
Delaney
DeRoven
Dickstein

Dietrich
Dingell
Dirksen
Disney
Ditter
Doughton
Doutrich
Duffey, Ohio
Dunn, Miss.
Dunn, Pa.
Eagle
Eaton
Edmiston
Ekwall
Farley
Fenerty
Ferguson
Fernandez
Fish
Fitzpatrick
Focht
Gavagan
Gildea
Goodwin
Greenwood
Greever
Gregory
Griswold
Hamlin
Hancock, N. C.
Hart
Hartley
Healey
Hill, Knute
Hill, Samuel B.
Hobbs
Hoeppe

Peyser
Plumley
Quinn
Rabaut
Reed, Ill.
Robinson, Utah
Romjue
Sadowski
Sanders, La.
Sandlin
Schaefer
Schuetz
Seger
Shanley
Sirovich
Snell
Snyder, Pa.
Somers, N. Y.
Stack
Starnes
Steagall
Summers, Tex.
Sutphin
Sweeney
Taylor, Colo.
Thomas
Wadsworth
Wallgren
Werner
Wigglesworth
Wilcox
Withrow
Wolfenden
Wolverton
Woodruff

So the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Maverick (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
Mrs. O'Day (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
Mr. Hartley (for) with Mr. Wigglesworth (against).
Mr. Duffey of Ohio (for) with Mr. Shanley (against).
Mr. Dingell (for) with Mr. Wolfenden (against).
Mr. Sadowski (for) with Mr. Focht (against).
Mr. Fitzpatrick (for) with Mr. Kleberg (against).
Mr. Knute Hill (for) with Mr. Allen (against).
Mr. Greever (for) with Mr. Robinson of Utah (against).
Mr. Kocalkowski (for) with Mr. Schuetz (against).
Mr. Gildea (for) with Mr. Carmichael (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Crowder.
Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. McFarlane with Mr. Goodwin.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Corning with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Christianson.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Thomas.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Marshall.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Cary with Mr. Fenerty.
Mr. Kelly with Mr. Culin.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Collins.
Mr. McAndrews with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. Starnes with Mr. Ekwall.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Millard.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Withrow.
Mr. Bean with Mr. Lundeen.
Mr. Parks with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Calborne.
Mr. Stack with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Sutphin.
Mr. Werner with Mr. Wallgren.
Mr. Eagle with Mr. Ferguson.
Mr. Montague with Mr. Monaghan.
Mr. Cross of Texas with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Oliver with Mr. Gregory.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Imhoff with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Farley with Mr. Montet.
Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania with Mr. McGrath.
Mr. Edmiston with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Moritz with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Dieterich.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Berlin.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Darden.
Mr. Keller with Mr. Sirovich.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Cartwright.
Mr. Sandlin with Mr. Brennan.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. McLaughlin.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Brennan with Mr. Buckley.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected and lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to reconsider the vote by which the bill was rejected and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want the Members to know that I cheerfully accept the verdict of the House with regard to this bill. [Applause.] Also I want them to know that the fight I made on the bill went far deeper than the bill itself. It was a fight for a principle; the principle is whether or not the House has the right to pass on legislation or be prevented from doing so by filibustering on legislation that has been properly reported out of a committee of the House. I am very grateful to the Committee on Rules for having brought in the rule, and I am also deeply grateful to

the Members for voting in favor of the rule to bring the bill up under orderly procedure, particularly since they were opposed to the bill.

I want my colleagues in the House to know that I have never sought as the chairman of this committee to influence legislation. I believe in correct procedure under the rules of the House, and that is the principle involved in the determined fight that I have made on the bill.

Whether or not the bill is constitutional is a question not even any lawyer in the House can determine, much less the chairman of your committee, who is not a lawyer. It is a fact, and the evidence has been offered in the consideration of the bill, that the Supreme Court has decided on two occasions that such a bill is constitutional; but, after all, that was not the question really involved in my fight on the bill. So far as the bill is concerned, I want you to know that last year when it was introduced in the House and voted out of the committee—I was not present when the vote was taken—I tried very hard to get the real-estate dealers of this city to consider the extreme cause of the people of the District of Columbia and they turned a deaf ear to any suggestions I had to make. To keep the record straight, at this point I want you to bear in mind that there are many fair-minded owners and real-estate people in the District. They are not in opposition to this bill. It then seemed obvious that the only thing to do, after repeated efforts to have the unfair real-estate people bring about a better understanding with their tenants and a fair adjustment of rents to bring the bill before the House. If the Members offered any constructive amendments to the bill they would have been accepted by your committee, or if a better bill were offered it could have been substituted for this bill. My only desire was to help the poor people of Washington.

I have made a sincere effort to assist the great mass of people here who are denied the right of representation in Congress. Thousands of citizens have appealed to me to do something about a situation that has become desperate. It was my duty as your chairman to do so, and the only reason I had for presenting this bill to the House. My conscience is absolutely clear in the matter. Communism has reared its ugly head into the consideration of this bill. I have no fear of communism so long as we remember that the rank and file of this great Nation is entitled to a square deal. When we try to throttle and destroy helpless citizens and deny to them the rights they are entitled to under the Constitution of our beloved country, then, indeed, shall we need to fear the destructive forces of communism. It was the last cry of a disturbed mind to bring the charge of communism into this bill.

You have voted on the bill, and I have no doubt that you feel you have voted correctly. I have no criticism to make about that. However, the real purpose of the filibuster was explained better than I can explain it by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] himself on April 15, when in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 5549, he said:

In order to prevent the consideration of the Sisson bill until we could have an opportunity to get before the Members of Congress the result of an investigation made by our Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the District supply bill, which caused our subcommittee to refuse to allow \$78,660 for so-called character education, and which hearings show conclusively that the Sisson bill should not pass, several of us having been doing all we could to delay the passage of the Ellenbogen bill, even if we are not able to defeat it, because immediately following its passage the Sisson bill will be called up for passage.

Further, on page 5549 of the RECORD, I quote:

If Rules Committee grants a rule on the Ellenbogen bill I want it to assume full responsibility for it should the bill pass, for I know without such a rule it would not be passed. And if we are limited to 1½ hours for amendments, I do not intend to make any effort whatever to stop its passage, for effort would be futile with that limited time allowed to present numerous amendments and the chairman controlling most of the time. And I want it to assume responsibility for the Sisson bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the first time during my service as a Member of this House that an attempt has been made to defeat one bill in order to prevent the consideration of another. Such parliamentary practice is disgraceful. Every bill should stand on its own feet.

When the Sisson bill comes before the House, I have not the slightest doubt it will be considered on its merits, and nothing less than fear of the outcome of your consideration would have thrown those opposed to the bill into so great a panic that 3 whole days were devoted to filibustering.

Certainly this fear should not have been made the basis of an attack on this bill or of having consumed 3 days of the time of this House, not to speak of the tremendous expense which the taxpayers of the entire country must bear as a result of the disgraceful filibustering tactics pursued in this House. Thank you sincerely for the fine consideration you have shown your chairman in order to keep the record straight. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 568. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, for the fiscal year 1936.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10630) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

PERRY'S VICTORY MEMORIAL COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Perry's Victory Memorial Commission for the year ended December 1, 1935.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 17, 1936.

TENTH PHILIPPINE LEGISLATURE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19 of the act of Congress approved August 29, 1916, entitled "An act to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, I transmit herewith copies of the laws and resolutions enacted by the Tenth Philippine Legislature during its second special session (from June 12 to June 22, 1935), its second regular session (from June 25 to Oct. 17, 1935), and its third special session (from Nov. 12 to Nov. 14, 1935), which was the final session of the bicameral legislature created by the above-mentioned act of Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 16, 1936.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR TIMBER OPERATIONS ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 215, to amend Public Act No. 435, Seventy-second Congress, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, strike out "March" and insert "September."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mrs. GREENWAY. Does the gentleman want me to explain it fully?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. No; just briefly. What is the bill about?

Mrs. GREENWAY. The bill is to allow a contractor to cut timber as a contractor on an Indian reservation, with the date postponed from March to September. It is with the approval of the Department of the Interior. The bill has passed both Houses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Arizona?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, constrained as I am not to, I object. The Indians have suffered enough.

COINAGE OF 50-CENT PIECES COMMEMORATING FOUNDING OF NEW ROCHELLE, N. Y.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 10489) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding and settlement of the city of New Rochelle, N. Y., with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding and settlement of the city of New Rochelle, N. Y., there shall be coined at a mint of the United States to be designated by the Director of the Mint not to exceed 25,000 silver 50-cent pieces of standard size, weight, and composition and of a special appropriate single design to be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, but the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

"Sec. 2. The coins herein authorized shall bear the date 1936, irrespective of the year in which they are minted or issued, shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value, and shall be issued only upon the request of a committee of not less than three persons duly authorized by the mayor of the city of New Rochelle, N. Y., upon payment by it of the par value of such coins, but not less than 5,000 such coins shall be issued to it at any one time and no such coins shall be issued after the expiration of 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. Such coins may be disposed of at par or at a premium by such committee, and the net proceeds shall be used by it in defraying the expenses incidental and appropriate to the commemoration of such event.

"Sec. 3. All laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coinage, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for the security of the coins, or for any other purposes, whether such laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. The bill provides for the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the city of New Rochelle, N. Y. The Senate amended the bill. The House had a policy which protects coin collectors, and this is simply to require them to coin 25,000 at any one time.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Michigan going to object to this or not?

Mr. COCHRAN. This bill passed both Houses.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I will not object if they do not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the Senate amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COCHRAN to the Senate amendment: On page 2, line 1, after the word "than", insert the word "twenty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withdraw that temporarily?

Mr. BLANTON. I will withdraw it.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSOURI VALLEY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the development of the Missouri Valley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, the Missouri River rises in southwestern Montana and flows in a general southeast direction and joins the Mississippi 15 miles north of St. Louis, Mo. This river is 2,470 miles long, and when united with the Mississippi, is the longest river system in the world. The Missouri River has a drainage area of 529,000 square miles. The maximum, mean, and minimum discharges at the mouth are, respectively, 900,000, 96,000, and 12,500 cubic feet per second. The total fall of the river from source to mouth is 3,630 feet.

The Missouri River flows through the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Missouri and borders the States of Iowa, Nebraska, and Kansas, thus bringing seven States within immediate proximity to whatever benefits may be derived from the development of this river system.

These States have a population of 14,000,000 people, and the area is the heart of the Agricultural Belt of the United States. In this area, including Minnesota (easily reached by power development), there is produced normally the following percentages of the Nation's principal food crops:

	Percent
Spring wheat.....	76
Durham wheat.....	100
Rye.....	70
Corn.....	50
Barley.....	60
Hogs.....	50

Fully 85 percent of all these crops are marketed east of the Mississippi River. These States constitute the heart of the land-locked empire of the United States. Freight rates are exorbitant for the reason that there is no competition in this area either actual or actively potential. A few tables will illustrate the unfairness in railroad rates:

Salina, Kans., to Chicago by rail, 1 bushel of wheat, 641 miles.....	\$0.21.5
Chicago to Buffalo by water, 1 bushel of wheat, 900 miles.....	1.5
Barge rate per bushel from Kansas City to St. Louis.....	2.4
Rail rate per bushel from Kansas City to St. Louis.....	6.6
Barge rate from Kansas City to Chicago per bushel.....	4.8
Rail rate from Kansas City to Chicago per bushel.....	9.0
From this area to New York, 100 pounds of milk by rail.....	1.10
Milk from Pacific coast to New York by water.....	.45

Of far greater importance comes the regulation of rates on electricity. The use of electricity in this area is extremely limited, and the agricultural area is wholly undeveloped as to the use and conveniences of electricity. Those who do use electricity are paying unjust rates and will continue to do so for all time unless some standard is set by which rates can be set. Using the T. V. A. yardstick on costs of generation and distribution of electricity, the people of these States are paying in excess of what a just rate would be the following sums annually:

Kansas.....	\$9,174,000
Iowa.....	12,480,000
Minnesota.....	14,460,000
Missouri.....	21,068,000
North Dakota.....	2,184,000
South Dakota.....	2,480,000
Nebraska.....	7,156,000
Montana-Utah.....	6,546,000

A total annual overcharge for these States in the Missouri River Valley system of \$75,548,000.

A 9-foot channel from Yankton to St. Louis could be assured for an expenditure of \$170,000,000. This whole gigantic river improvement could be paid for in 28 months by the people who use electricity in this area if their electric rate were reduced to a rate measured by the T. V. A. rates.

From 1803, when the United States purchased this great area from Spain upon the demand of Napoleon, until 1866, this great river was the only transportation system known to this immense area outside of the wagon and Indian travois.

With the coming of the Union Pacific, the Northern Pacific, and the Great Northern this great river system remained only as a part of the history of the West so far as transportation was concerned. In the meantime an empire has been carved out of the fertile West and lost to the generation that built it and to their sons and daughters, and the principal single cause has been the discriminative freight rates which these people have been compelled to pay, because there has been no competition. The great power of competition, the great power to substitute easier, better, and cheaper transportation has lain dormant for over a half century, but at all times open and accessible to the inhabitants to free them and emancipate them from this land-locked empire. It will take only the united public opinion of the people living in this area to grasp the opportunities of the use of this great water system, which will provide competition in transportation rates, furnish them with cheap electric energy, increase the fertility of the soil, prevent the untold loss of property and suffering occasioned by floods along its course and prevent 50,000 acres from being washed away annually.

Our receded lakes will be restored and the old western paradise, with its flowers, trees, song and game birds, will be a living likeness of God's own handiwork.

For the relief of people, North and South, no program of equal proportions has been suggested in Congress for a generation. To the administration that will drive ahead with this all-important program will go the credit of doing more for this great western empire than any single accomplishment since the Government began.

The vision of our engineers and statesmen who were responsible for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the benefit of all the people, and the elimination of private profit, has awakened the sleeping West to the great opportunities that lie before it. Senator Norris, Congressman Rankin, and Governor Weaver, and other great leaders have focused the attention of the people of the West on the question of their natural right to use the benefits bestowed by Providence. This great area has become power conscious; they realize now that immediately before them lies the means by which they can live and prosper. There will be no turning back now, and the railroads and the private power companies who have sapped the life of the people of this area through unconscionable rates, unrestrained by competition, have been notified that their reign over a free people has now been questioned.

In order to equalize prosperity throughout the Nation there must be a diffusion of manufacturing, and so far in its history this great landlocked empire has been discriminated against. Excessive rail rates, on raw material in and on finished products out, have kept the West strangled industrially.

The census reports indicate that in the period from 1920 to 1930, 14½ percent of the area of the United States had an increase in population of 67.7 percent of the Nation's total increase. This 14½ percent of the area was territory within 50 miles of the seaboard, Lakes, and the Gulf, and here the population increased eleven and one-half millions. The reason is plain, for here in this strip of territory the principal industries of the Nation are located.

The West is still unsettled, and there is land enough in this area to provide homes for the millions who are unemployed and those other millions who are living on public and private charity. The West does not ask any special favors or any special privilege; all it asks is an equal chance with

the rest of the country. Let its natural industries survive and grow and the whole Nation will be benefited. Railroads cannot complain, because with more people coming into the territory more needs must be satisfied. This brings increased business in transportation. Small business at high rates cannot be compared in economic soundness to reduced rates and enough business.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 568. Joint resolution to provide an additional appropriation for fees of jurors and witnesses, United States courts, for the fiscal year 1936.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution amending paragraph (4) of subsection (n) of section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, April 20, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

784. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress, supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Executive Office and certain independent executive establishments, amounting to \$1,629,000 for the fiscal year 1936 and \$279,000 for the fiscal year 1937, in all \$1,908,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 457); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

785. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the act of April 27, 1904 (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 583, par. 2), records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts, as submitted through the Secretary of the Treasury, which require an appropriation of \$11,268.46 for their payment (H. Doc. No. 456); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

786. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress, estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for damages to privately owned property caused by an employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the sum of \$30.25 (H. Doc. No. 455); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

787. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the Navy in the sum of \$91.34 (H. Doc. No. 454); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of Congress, deficiency and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1937 and prior years, amounting to \$12,125,762.61, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 453); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to Public Resolution 126, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 2, 1931, the proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the American Legion, held at St. Louis, Mo.,

September 23-26, 1935 (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MILLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2039. An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2040. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes", approved September 7, 1916, and acts in amendment thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12006. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Kennebec River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12007. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Penobscot River, Maine, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12008. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Androscoggin River, in Maine and New Hampshire, and its tributaries, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12031. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination of the Pawtuxet River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12079. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of the Poteau River, in Arkansas, with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement; with amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12080. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination of the Sulphur River, in Arkansas, with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement; with amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12133. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Congaree, Santee, and the Cooper Rivers and their tributaries in the State of South Carolina, with a view to the control of their floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12135. A bill providing for a preliminary examination of the Sandusky River at Fremont, Ohio, with a view to control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12158. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination of the Patuxent River and its tributaries in the State of Maryland, with a view to the control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WERNER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12073. A bill to reserve certain public-domain lands in New Mexico

as an addition to the school reserve of the Jicarilla Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WERNER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12074. A bill to consolidate the Indian pueblos of Jemez and Pecos, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1494. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota to submit claims to the Court of Claims", approved May 14, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 555); without amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEMPSEY: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. R. 12298. A bill to provide a civil government for the Virgin Islands of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 12182. A bill for the relief of J. L. Summers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 10376. A bill for the relief of Maizee Hamley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10436. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Margaretta D. Fenn, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 2445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BEITER: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 10729. A bill for the relief of Charles Augustus Lathrop; without amendment (Rept. No. 2446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 12351) to amend the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, approved February 28, 1935, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRY: A bill (H. R. 12352) to provide for the local delivery rate on certain first-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 12353) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MALONEY: A bill (H. R. 12354) to modify the basis for computing net income in case of the liquidation of a corporation following the sale of its business to another corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H. R. 12355) to authorize wrestling in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COCHRAN: A bill (H. R. 12356) to amend paragraph 5 of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 12357) to prohibit expenditures for the members of the military and naval forces of the United States who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 12358) granting an increase of pension to Melissa F. Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOYKIN: A bill (H. R. 12359) for the relief of George Smith and Ketha Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12360) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Lucius Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12361) for the relief of Marian Stephens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARLAN: A bill (H. R. 12362) for the relief of George E. Kinner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 12363) for the relief of Esai Sak; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12364) for the relief of Daniel Morgan Weldon; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 12365) to correct the military record of Edward W. Beyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12366) for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 12367) for the relief of John Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 12368) for the relief of the city of New Brunswick, N. J.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH: A bill (H. R. 12369) for the relief of George H. Hutchinson, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10740. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition in the nature of a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, urging Congress to accept immediate responsibility for relief and employment of transients; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10741. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of 40 residents of the city of Kingston, N. Y., regarding the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10742. Also, petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to place responsibility upon the Works Progress Administration for employment and relief of transients; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10743. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the New York City Housing Authority, Langdon Post, chairman, New York City, concerning the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10744. Also, petition of Thomas S. Holden, president, New York Building Congress, endorsing the Hayden-Beiter public-works bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10745. Also, petition of the Building Trades Employers Association of New York City, endorsing the Beiter public-works bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 20, 1936

(Legislative day of Monday, Feb. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of the Senate for the calendar days April 9 to April 17, 1936, inclusive, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.